STORAGE-ITEM
MAIN LIBRARY

LPA-A70D
U.B.C. LIBRARY

Library
of the University of
British Columbia

Accession No. 73800
Call No. HM 66. B86 Cop. 1

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

BY

FREDERICK A. BUSHEE, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

NEW YORK

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1930,
BY
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INC.

PRINTED IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To

MY WIFE

WHOSE CONSTANT ASSISTANCE
HAS MADE THIS BOOK POSSIBLE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of British Columbia Library

http://www.archive.org/details/socialorganizati00bush

PREFACE

This book is intended to serve as a text for an introductory course in sociology. In my opinion, books which are much too advanced and abstract are being used for texts in courses for beginners, and because of this fact many students become discouraged and lose interest in any further pursuit of sociology. This is unfortunate, because sociological subjects ought to be of vital interest to every student.

The natural approach to the various branches of sociology is the study of the society in which one lives. Just as the botanist begins by studying the plants in his own neighborhood, the student of sociology should first of all learn to analyze and evaluate the organizations and institutions in his own community. This book is intended to form the basis for an introduction of this kind. It is in fact a community study. It begins with a description of the various forms of association, and then proceeds to more detailed analyses of permanent organizations. The method of treatment of all these organizations is similar. In every case three questions are asked and discussed: first, what is the purpose of the organization; second, to what extent does it fulfil its purpose; and, third, what can be done to improve it?

In teaching a subject of this kind there is great advantage in having each student take an active part in contributing to the interest and success of the course. With this object in view the text itself is generally limited to the more theoretical considerations underlying the various social institutions, and the actual facts concerning them—which differ so widely in different communities—are left for the student to ascertain and report upon. In my own conduct of this course, I have sent students out, sometimes two together, to investigate various institutions and organizations and to report concerning their activities and achievements. This method has been

profitable, both because it arouses the interest of the student, and because it increases his ability to judge and to appreciate social organizations.

While I am convinced that investigation at first hand is the most valuable method of study even for beginners, I realize that it is a method not always feasible in every institution. Where it is not, much of the information sought can be gained from library study.

It is my hope that the methods and materials which I have found so satisfactory in my own introductory course will also prove useful to other teachers of sociology.

FREDERICK A. BUSHEE.

Boulder, Colorado,
January, 1930.

CONTENTS

Chapter I

The Study of Sociology

	PAGE
The Physical Environment	3
The Social Environment	4
Social Science a Recent Study	4
The Nature of the Social Sciences	5
Sociology Distinguished from the Social Sciences	6
Sociology Has Several Subdivisions	7
Summary	11
The Study of the Social Organization	12
The Purpose of the Study of Sociology	12
Precautions to be Observed by Students	16

Chapter II

Forms and Purposes of Social Groups

Human Beings Desire Group Life	19
Types of Associations	19
Results of Association Upon the Individual	23
Social Purposes of Organization	26
Classification of Social Groups	28
Characteristics of Different Forms of Association	29
Large and Small Groups Compared	31

Chapter III

Modern Trends in Social Groups

The Trend Towards Large Groups	36
Economic Causes of This Trend	36
Improvements in production	37
Improvements in transportation	37

PAGE

Characteristics of Large Unorganized Associations . 38
Acquaintance is superficial 38
Association is formal 39
Forms of communication have changed 41
Thought itself is more superficial 42
Art is used to supplement association 43
Effects of Large Unorganized Associations . . . 44
Decline in personal development 44
The growth in rivalries 45
Characteristics of Large Formal Organizations . . 46
The individual is of little importance 46
Leadership is of great importance 47
Large organizations are not adaptable 47
Large organizations tend to enforce uniformity . . 48
The struggle for improvement 50
The Multiplication of Organized Associations and Its Effects 52
Contacts are superficial 52
Institutions are neglected 53
Their relative importance has declined 54
Summary and Conclusion 56

Chapter IV

The Economic Organization

Purpose of the Economic Organization 58
Characteristics of the Economic Organization . . 58
Interdependence and division of labor 58
Absence of coördination 59
Preponderance of individual initiative 60
Problems of the Economic Organization . . . 61
Ideal standards for the production of wealth . . . 61
Ideal standards for the distribution of wealth . . . 63
Summary 64
The System of Production is Relatively Efficient . 65
Defects of the System of Production 66
Production is wasteful 66
Labor is forced into undesirable tasks 68

PAGE

Labor works long hours 69
METHODS OF INCREASING PRODUCTION 70
Progress in technique of production 70
Better industrial management needed 70
Improvements in the quality of labor 72
Increase in the supply of capital 73
DEFECTS IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH . . . 74
Explanation of low wages 75
Explanation of high incomes 78
Summary 79
POSSIBILITY OF A MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH 80
CONCLUSION 82

Chapter V

THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION (*continued*)

INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION A SERIOUS EVIL 84
CAUSES OF DEPRESSIONS 85
BETTER ORGANIZATION NEEDED 86
READJUSTMENTS IN AGRICULTURE AND IN INDUSTRY COMPARED 87
POSSIBILITIES OF IMPROVEMENT 88
PROBLEMS OF THE CONSUMPTION OF WEALTH . . . 89
PROBLEM OF THE SELECTION OF SPECIFIC COMMODITIES . 90
Consumers are unintelligent buyers 90
They purchase goods of poor quality 92
The effect upon prices 93
Summary 93
PREFERENCES IN THE DESIRES GRATIFIED 94
The satisfaction of physical needs 94
Social rivalries are of great importance 95
The satisfaction of intellectual needs 97
Summary 98
THE UTILIZATION OF COMMODITIES 99
Much wealth is destroyed 99
Much wealth is wasted 100
CONCLUSION 101

Chapter VI

The Family

PAGE

The Family the Foundation of Society 104
The Character of the Family Association . . . 104
Changes in the Character of the Family Association 105
The Decline in the Functions of the Family . . 107
Changes in the Physical Characteristics of the Home 108
The Problem of Divorce 110
The Essential Functions of the Family . . . 112
The Problem of Sexual Mating 112
The difficulties of mutual adaptation 114
The need for high ideals 116
The need for a more serious attitude towards marriage . 117
The need for a wide circle of acquaintance . . . 118
Summary 119
The Problem of Child Training 119
The influence of heredity 120
The physical care of the child 121
The social and intellectual training of the child . . 122
The benefits of social life within the home . . . 125
Family Life Essential for the Welfare of Adults . 127
Conclusion 127

Chapter VII

The Problems of Population

Recent Trends in Birth and Death Rates . . . 130
The Ideal Size of the Family Group 132
The Actual Size Does Not Conform to the Ideal . 134
Reasons for Differences in Size of Families . . 135
Summary 136
The Attitude of Society Towards the Growth of Population 137
Requirements for War Purposes 138
A New Country Profits by an Increase 139

PAGE

Economic results 139
Social results 139
Social and Family Interests Coincide in a New Community 140
An Old Country Profits Little from an Increase . 140
Economic results 140
Social advantages 142
Summary 143
Social and Family Interests Coincide in Advanced Communities 144
Would a Stationary Population Be Desirable? . . 145
Historical Aspects of the Problem of Population . 146
The Problem of the Future 148
Summary 149
The Problem of the Quality of the Population . . 150
The Science of Eugenics 151
The Program of Eugenics 152
The control of defectives 152
Increasing the numbers of the superiors 153
Conclusion 155

Chapter VIII

The State

Definition 158
State Activities Tend to Increase 158
Functions of the State 159
Self-preservation the first duty of the state . . . 159
Preservation of internal order 161
Promotion of the general welfare 161
The Character of the State Organization . . . 163
Early Forms of Political Organization . . . 166
Modern Concepts of the State 167
Defects of a Democratic Form of Government . . 168
Defects in the social organization 169
Inferior quality of state officials 170
Remuneration is small 174

PAGE
State officials are not specialists 175
Summary 176
The Problem of Improving the Democratic State . 176
Defects to be remedied 177
Advantages to be retained 177
Greater social equality desirable 178
More general education needed 179
A new conception of democracy 179
Conclusion 181

Chapter IX

The Administration of Justice

The Administration of Justice Requires a Complex Organization 183
Methods of Administering Justice Have Greatly Improved 183
Standards of Efficiency in the Administration of Justice 184
Defects in the Police System 185
Reforms Needed in the Police System 188
Defects in the Courts 188
Technicalities of the law 188
Delays of the law 189
The question of favoritism 190
The penalties imposed 191
Reforms Needed in the Court System 193
Revision of the rules of procedure 193
The jury system 195
The powers of the judge 196
The system of appeals 197
Reorganization of the courts 198
The personnel of the judiciary 198
Summary of basic reforms 201
Appointment or Election of Judges 201
Conclusion 204

Chapter X

The School

PAGE
The Importance of the School 207
The Purposes of Education 207
The socialization of the individual 208
The acquisition of knowledge 209
The development of the faculties 210
Schools Share the Work of Education with Other Institutions 211
The Educational Policy of the Schools 211
Limitations upon the Educational Work of the Schools 212
Lack of financial resources 212
Lack of the desire for education 212
Characteristics of School Associations 214
Schools are small associations 214
Schools are primary associations 215
Schools are decentralized 216
Public and private schools compared 218
The Schools and the Work of Socialization . . . 221
The Schools and the Work of Instruction . . . 222
Deficiencies due to lack of funds 224
The difficulties of teaching large numbers . . . 225

Chapter XI

The School (*continued*)

The Curriculum 227
Determination of the general course of study . . . 227
Specific subjects of study 231
The sequence of subjects 231
Methods of Instruction are Ineffective . . . 233
Too many subjects are taught 234
The interest of the pupils is not aroused 234
The process of learning is too passive 235
Subjects studied show little practical bearing . . . 237
Subjects are not well coördinated 238

PAGE

The Influence of the Schools on Individual Development 239
The School Must Be Rated as a Relatively Efficient Institution 241
The Schools are Enlarging Their Activities . . 242
Conclusion 245

Chapter XII

Recreational Organizations

The Significance of Recreation 248
The Purposes of Recreation 248
Recreation Distinguished from Other Activities . 250
The Problems of Recreation 252
Characteristics of the different kinds of recreations . . 252
Recreational needs of different classes in the population . 255
Deficiencies of Recreational Life 258
Many persons take no recreation 258
Recreational facilities are not adequate 261
Recreations are not wisely chosen 262
Possible Reforms in Organized Recreation . . . 264
A director of recreation is needed 264
The organization of a recreational department . . . 266
Scope of the work of the recreational department . . 267
A recreational survey desirable 269
The organization of outdoor sports 269
The organization of indoor amusements 270
The Duties of a Recreational Department Summarized 272
Conclusion 273

Chapter XIII

The Church

The Universal Prominence of the Church . . . 276
The Fundamentals of Religious Belief 276
The Purpose of the Church 278

PAGE

The Character of Church Associations 280
Defects of the Church 281
The church fails to attract the people 281
Church attendance is perfunctory 284
The church tends to become conservative 286
Leadership tends to mediocrity 286
Clerical education is conservative 287
Proposals for Extending the Influence of the Church 288
The Church and Philanthropic Work 290
The Church and Social Work 293
The Difficulties Encountered by the Church in Conducting Social Work 295
The Value of Denominational Churches as Compared with a Community Church 297
Summary and Conclusion 300

Chapter XIV

Associations for the Promotion of Science and Art

I. *Associations for the Promotion of Science*

The Benefits of Scientific Knowledge 305
Does Science Contribute to Well-being? . . . 307
Existing Organizations for the Advancement of Science 308
The Suitability of Universities as Places for Scientific Research 310
More Adequate Support is Needed for Scientific Research 313
Funds are Now Often Ineffectively Employed . . 314
Problems of the Utilization of Knowledge . . . 315
Different Types of Discoveries Require Different Means of Utilization 317
Conclusion 319

II. *Associations for the Promotion of Art*

PAGE
The Purposes of Art 320
Existing Associations for the Promotion of Art . . 320
The Educative Value of an Esthetic Environment . 322
Two Factors in the Development of Art . . . 323
The Present Status of Art in the United States . 323
Methods of Encouraging Popular Appreciation of Art 326
The Development of Artistic Talent 328
Conclusion 328

Chapter XV

The Interdependence of Social Institutions

The Complexity of Social Relationships . . . 331
The Interrelationships of Individuals and Society . 333
The Relative Importance of the Different Institutions 334
The Relative Importance of Social Institutions Varies at Different Historical Periods . . . 336
The Economic Organization is at Present of Paramount Importance 336
The Interdependence of Social Institutions Hastens Progress 338
Social Institutions are Highly Adaptable . . . 340
Dangers Due to the Elasticity of Institutions . . 341
The Functions of Social Organizations Summarized 343
Preliminary considerations 343
Normal social relationships 344
The economic organization 344
The family 345
The state 346
Judicial institutions 348
Cultural institutions 349
Conclusion 351
Index 353

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY

The Physical Environment. Man lives in a physical environment surrounded and influenced by various natural forces. He lives also in company with other human beings, and his life and his actions are continually affected by the opinions and activities of other people. The natural forces influencing man are technically called his physical environment. The human elements affecting him are called his social environment.

In the process of satisfying desires and in the attempt to make existence more tolerable, man has had to study natural forces in order to control and utilize nature and her products; and as his understanding of these forces has grown his relationship to them has undergone a change. He has lost many of his superstitions regarding the power of nature; and, no longer submitting passively to her whims, he has been gradually obtaining mastery over her and has become increasingly able to control the natural forces and direct them to his advantage. He is able to utilize both animal and vegetable life for his own profit. Being superior to all other forms of life, man considers himself the object and end of the whole scheme of nature; and everything which contributes to his well-being he calls good, and everything which can injure him he calls evil. Instead of passively accepting the free products of nature and merely utilizing those adapted to his needs, he actually eliminates those plants and animals which are injurious and improves the useful ones. Furthermore, he has learned also to direct such natural forces as water power, heat, magnetism, and electricity, to work for him on a vast scale, giving him power in the manufacture of goods and in the means of transportation which his own physical energies would never yield. This deeper knowledge of nature's laws has been the means of

contributing enormously to human well-being by increasing so extensively the useful commodities at man's disposal. And the effect on human societies of increase in wealth and in the means of transportation has been to furnish support for much larger populations, and at the same time to permit people to live in much closer contact with one another than ever before.

The knowledge which has been acquired concerning the various forces of nature when classified and presented in the form of laws is called the natural sciences.

The Social Environment. The second form of environment, that composed of other human beings, is also an object of study; and the attempt is continually being made to control it for the benefit sometimes of the select few and sometimes of the majority. But so far our control of the social environment has been much less effective and complete than our control of the physical environment. We try to destroy individuals and even whole peoples who are injurious to us, in the same way that we have tried to eliminate noxious plants and animals. We prepare new parts of the earth for human habitation and we enlarge the food supply to stimulate the growth of populations, just as we have cultivated plants and animals for human use. But so far we have been unable to improve the quality of human beings, as we have improved the quality of plants and animals through special cultivation and breeding. Nor have we made much progress in improving human relations and in utilizing human energy for social betterment, as we have utilized physical forces. This does not mean that no improvement in social relations has occurred, for certainly over long periods of time progress has been made. But such improvement has been largely the result of the mere automatic adjustment of individuals to their environment, rather than the outcome of conscious organization and direction of social forces towards a given end through an understanding of their nature. Comprehension of these social forces is the object of the social sciences.

Social Science a Recent Study. The social sciences are bound to be as important for human well-being as are the physical sciences, though in quite a different way. While the

physical sciences give us the material means for life and enjoyment, the social sciences enable us to regulate the relationships of peoples with one another and improve the social organization, so that the individual will actually realize a superior and happier existence.

The study of the social sciences has lagged behind the study of the natural sciences for several reasons. The chief one is that the need of studying social organizations was not felt until people began to live in large groups and in close contact, and this condition was possible only after the physical sciences had made considerable progress. With increasing density of population people affect one another more and more intimately, life necessarily becomes more highly organized, and so the defects of social existence become apparent. Only then do men begin a systematic study of social relations with the object of improving them.

The Nature of the Social Sciences. People living in dense societies influence and assist one another in many ways. Even from the earliest times men have associated for the production of wealth to satisfy their material needs; but in modern times the economic organization has become so large and complicated that the problems arising out of it have required special study for their solution. This field is known as the social science of economics; and it has now become so extensive that it has many subdivisions for the study of its different phases.

From early times also people have combined and organized for their mutual defense against attacks of other people; and these organizations have gradually extended their scope to include a great variety of activities for the promotion of the general welfare. This association, which is called the state, is of great importance; and its organization and functions are studied in the science of politics, or government.

In a complex social organization it is easy for persons who follow their own inclinations without regard to others to interfere with the rights of other people and injure them to the detriment of society itself. It has always been necessary, therefore, for society to regulate and control the acts of indi-

viduals so that the best interests of all might be furthered. With this in view, rules of conduct have been formulated into a science of ethics, which, if observed by everyone, would make a complicated social life possible without inconvenience or suffering from the encroachment of individuals upon one another's rights. In as much as many do not voluntarily observe these rules, complicated organizations of justice have had to be established to restrain by force those who would injure others and to guarantee to all their equal rights.

Still other forms of association exist, which have become objects of special study as problems concerning them have arisen. The small family group is one of the earliest of social organizations, and a large amount of material has now been collected about it. The need of education has brought about association for the purpose of obtaining instruction, and education has now become an important social science. The need also for recreation and social intercourse has caused the organization of groups for the purpose of fostering them; but these subjects, while affording material for a science, have not yet received much scientific study.

It is obvious, therefore, that individuals in dense societies coöperate with one another in a great variety of ways and for many purposes. The forms of association must be studied if we are to understand their purposes; and much careful labor must be applied to them if we are to improve their organization and adapt them to the work which they are expected to perform. Already a large body of knowledge has been accumulated concerning many of them. These studies of human associations organized for special purposes are known as the special social sciences; and they include such subjects as economics, politics, ethics, education, and comparative religions.

Sociology Distinguished from the Social Sciences. Some of the social sciences have been pursued for a long period of time and have now reached a high stage of development. The information collected has been of great assistance to us in understanding and improving social organizations; yet it has proved far from sufficient for our purposes. There has

still remained a gap in our knowledge which we have only recently been attempting to fill. This deficiency is due to the fact that each of the social sciences confines itself to only one of the departments of social life and ignores their interrelations. So while a study of the various social sciences does give us many facts about the different departments of social life, these, being isolated and unconnected, fail to give a true picture of social life as a whole. Specific forms of social organization, such as the economic and the political, are in actual life closely interrelated; and they are continually exerting an influence one upon the other.

Moreover, the individuals themselves who belong to the various social organizations do not live separate and isolated lives in each one. On the contrary, they live their lives as a unit. They enter into various forms of association as phases of this existence; and they are influenced by each, so that their personalities are formed through the various contacts they make. They in turn exert their influence on other individuals and on organizations, as personalities which have themselves been fashioned by these agencies. Society, then, while made up of many parts, is nevertheless a unit because all these parts are closely interrelated. Therefore, as the pursuit of the various social sciences provides only partial and one-sided views of man's social life, we are now attempting to supplement our fragmentary knowledge of social relationships by an analysis of society as a whole. This study of the social life of man taken as a unit is called the science of sociology. It differs from the special social sciences in being much more inclusive. Each of them deals with one phase of social life, while sociology attempts to encompass social life in its entirety.

Sociology Has Several Subdivisions. Such a comprehensive program as that proposed may seem too pretentious and inclusive. If a social science, dealing with one phase of social life only, becomes so complicated as to require several subdivisions, how, it may be asked, can sociology be expected to embrace all social activities? But sociology, while admittedly a difficult science, is not really so complicated as it appears at first sight, for it has never contemplated the inclusion

of all the details of the social sciences into a single science. Leaving to the various social sciences the formulation of their own special laws, it restricts itself to the elucidation of those general principles, or laws, which govern social life in its entirety.

When we come to view society as a whole, however, we find that it is many-sided and can be approached from several angles. So sociology, like other sciences, has almost from the start been subdivided into several branches, each viewing society from a different angle. A description of some of these different points of view will be helpful in classifying the subject matter and will throw further light upon the nature of sociology as a science.

Sociology may, for instance, be studied from the historical point of view, tracing the origin and development of the societies themselves and of the various institutions which they comprise. Such a study might be supposed to come within the province of history, and in a sense it does. But ordinarily history goes into too much detail for sociological purposes. A description of social development would take into account only those great changes which have taken place in social institutions and the causes for them. However interesting this branch of sociology may be, little headway has been made in it yet, though there have been several attempts to construct a history of civilization, and anthropologists have recently added to our knowledge of social origins.

Sociology may, however, confine its scope to the investigation of social life as it actually exists today. Such a study of existing society has sometimes been subjective and psychological; and sometimes it has been objective, treating of external phenomena. The psychological approach to sociology has been especially popular of late. In as much as human beings are thinking animals, their association is not merely physical but in a greater degree it is mental. Social organization itself is based upon the ideas transmitted from individual to individual. The psychological forms of association and the various laws governing them are therefore so fundamental that they throw light upon all other social relations. This approach to

sociology is closely related to the science of psychology; and its subject matter has already become an intermediate science, or a department of psychology. Objective studies of sociology investigate the actual organization of society and examine its various institutions with special regard to their proper functions. These studies may be merely descriptive, though usually sociology has for its ultimate object the formulation of laws of cause and effect.

Sociology, again, may concentrate its attention upon social progress. Society is of course continually undergoing changes, usually it is to be hoped for the better; and inquiry into the laws governing the development of institutions, or of society as a whole, is a favorite branch of sociology. It differs both in point of view and in subject matter from the objective approach previously mentioned, which centers its interest upon society as it exists at any particular time and merely investigates social organizations and their functions. In tracing social progress, this branch of sociology investigates the changes which associations and institutions have undergone, with special reference to the conditions and forces which will tend to their normal development and perfection. The former is the simpler subject for consideration and should normally precede the latter.

Another branch of social study, and the one in which the majority of people show perhaps the greatest interest, is concerned with the investigation and treatment of specific problems of social life. This really deals with the diseases or abnormal conditions of the social organization, and may be compared to medicine among the biological sciences. It is entirely different from an analysis of social progress, though each has for its object the attainment of normal growth. While sociology, when it traces social progress, deals with the normal forces at work, this branch confines itself to abnormal or pathological conditions in society. An illustration from plant life will make the distinction clear. We may investigate the conditions under which a plant grows normally; that is, the proper treatment of the seed, the quality of the soil best adapted to it, and the amount of moisture and sunshine it

needs. All this concerns healthy plant growth and is quite different from an investigation of the diseases and pests which may attack the plant, though these may interfere with its normal growth or even destroy it. Now the normal aspects of society are really of primary importance; but in society, as in plant life, certain diseases or abnormal conditions may arise which demand specific remedies. The study of these social problems is not strictly speaking a part of the theoretical principles of sociology at all. It is rather an application of those principles to a specific field.

These two branches of social study—the one the formulation of the laws of the social order and the other the solution of social problems or the amelioration of social conditions—while related to be sure, should be carefully distinguished. The former should come first since it ascertains the laws which have to be used in the solution of social problems. The diagnosis and treatment of social abnormalities is a much more difficult and advanced field of work than the investigation of normal social conditions; and they should only be attempted after a thorough comprehension of normal conditions and normal social forces has been attained. Yet the custom still persists of making a study of abnormalities the introduction to the study of sociology. This procedure is similar to that of making a study of the diseases which attack the human body precede the study of anatomy and physiology.

A still greater error perhaps is made in the frequent assumption that anyone with common sense and benevolent intentions is competent to reform the social order even though he knows nothing of the laws of associated life and of social growth. This is like putting the surgeon's knife into the hands of a person who is stirred with deep sympathy over the deplorable condition of a patient but who has no knowledge of anatomy. As a matter of fact the reform of society is a stupendous task, requiring not only theoretical knowledge of social laws but great wisdom in the application of those laws to the problems presented. To attempt to alter the social order by making over other people's lives might well make the most valiant hesitate. Moreover, we have not yet acquired

sufficient knowledge of social laws to undertake reforms with much assurance of a successful outcome, so that interference under these circumstances is often of doubtful wisdom. Social guidance is at best a sort of hit or miss policy. The ineffectiveness of reforms by the merely well-intentioned is evident in the feeble results which have attended their efforts, when, indeed, no positive harm has occurred. If efforts are not misdirected they seldom go deep enough to accomplish permanent results. It is really to be hoped, however, that in the near future more comprehensive and scientific measures can be used to ameliorate social conditions. These will have to be the outcome of continuous and careful study of the social forces working in society.

Summary. To review this section briefly, we find that there are two great branches of sociology: the investigation of social laws, which forms the subject matter of scientific sociology; and the application of those laws for the amelioration of social conditions, or the solution of social problems, which is known as applied sociology, or sometimes merely as the study of social problems. Moreover, scientific sociology itself has several branches. It may investigate the psychological laws of association—namely, the laws of the interaction of minds—or it may turn to a consideration of objective social conditions. Logically the study of social psychology should precede the analysis of social organization, in as much as the objective forms of association are expressions of mental life. In practice, however, this order is not absolutely necessary; and it would be by no means the simplest form of introduction to the subject. In studying objective social institutions several methods of approach may be employed. We may use the historical method and follow the order of their development, or we may start with an examination of existing social phenomena as we see them about us in our own communities. In the latter case we should seek to understand the organization of society and the purposes of the various forms of association. Finally, instead of studying the functions of the various institutions, we may investigate the laws of their growth and development. While the various divisions of the subject should

be distinguished and kept separate, consideration of all of them is nevertheless essential for a comprehensive understanding of the social organization in its entirety.

The Study of the Social Organization. The purpose of the present volume, it may be explained here, is neither to study social psychology nor social progress, but rather to make an investigation of social life and social organizations as they exist today. It is in a sense a community study. It considers first the simplest forms of association in which we ourselves are daily involved. Then it proceeds to the more formal kinds of associated life and studies the more important permanent organizations instituted and sanctioned by society for specific purposes, sometimes called social institutions. The analysis of these institutions, which comprises the major part of the book, is devoted chiefly to their forms of organization and their purposes, but account is taken also of their weaknesses and of the possible means for their improvement. In considering their defects, however, we are not making a study of social diseases. There is no intention of entering the field of social problems. The aim is rather to ascertain the shortcomings of normal forms of association in a society that is in no sense ideal and to find the means by which they can be made to function more effectively. This kind of study probably furnishes the simplest and most natural approach to the social sciences, because it deals with those conditions in which the student himself is living and which, therefore, he can observe and analyze for himself.

The Purpose of the Study of Sociology. From this description of the possible methods of studying the social sciences, we may turn next to a consideration of the general purpose of sociology and point out in this connection the various methods that are used in investigating social phenomena, although some intimation of its aims has already been given. In general it may be said that the ultimate purpose of every science is utility. If the knowledge acquired in any particular field were never to be of use to humanity, it would certainly not be worth anyone's time and effort to pursue it. We study the sciences either with the immediate or the

ultimate aim of putting the knowledge gained to some useful purpose; and the incentive for studying a science has often, though not always, been the immediate desire to apply the knowledge. Probably in the past all the sciences have developed gradually under the stimulus of pressing need. Even at the present time we seek scientific knowledge from the same incentive and utilize our results immediately for practical purposes. But there has come to be a second incentive to scientific research which is gradually causing its systematic extension in all fields. This new force may be called a desire for knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Since scientific laws have shown their utility in so many unforeseen ways scientists have become convinced that all knowledge may be useful ultimately if not immediately. Even when scientific truths have no practical application themselves they can frequently throw light on related subjects and stimulate discoveries in neighboring fields. Consequently scientists are devoting themselves to filling in gaps and completing information in all fields, without any immediate reference to the direct utilization of the truths which come to light. This new attitude towards scientific truth has undoubtedly given a great impetus to research; but it should not be interpreted as being inconsistent with the general proposition that science is pursued chiefly for purposes of practical utilization.

If, then, knowledge is usually desired for the attainment of some special purpose, our task is to consider the specific advantages to be derived from the study of the various branches of sociology. Of course the first and most important object of all social studies is the improvement and ultimate perfection of the social organization. In investigating the field of social institutions we shall come to realize how crude these organizations still are in form, and how inadequately they are carried on, often by self-seeking persons of narrow vision contented to follow an out-grown routine instead of striving with intelligent foresight to shape their organizations to the purposes for which they were intended. In short, human associations are imperfect and composed of imperfect individuals,

and the first object of sociology is to analyze the nature of the imperfections and indicate possible measures of reform.

Many social defects are so obvious that they may be perceived by the untrained observer; but there is nothing obvious about the remedies needed. Society is so complex and the interrelation of forces so intricate that the source of an evil may lie deeply hidden. Indeed, it may not even be inherent in the institution concerned but may be found in some related institution; or it may come from some distant source, just as disease in the human body may be traceable to a foreign source of infection. Now it is the object of the social scientist so to elucidate the interaction of social forces that, whatever the difficulty may be, reformers may be able to trace its true origin.

It is evident enough that the only effective way to improve social relations and perfect social institutions is to concentrate on basic causes and remedy evils where they start. The chief obstacle to the achievement of a more perfect social order is the lack of a comprehensive knowledge of cause and effect in society. Yet we are constantly trying to improve surface conditions without attacking sources of evil. We persistently resort to legislation to abolish evils by merely forbidding them, or we institute crude or mistaken measures of reform. The law is, to be sure, an essential and often a very effective instrument for social reform; but it is remedial only when directed towards the removal of fundamental causes of evil, and it should be based upon a scientific diagnosis of the social disease involved. At present the law is used much too hastily by legislators ignorant of cause and effect in social life.

The first purpose then of the study of sociology concerns the improvement of the normal social organization. Its second purpose is to procure that fundamental information which shall furnish an intelligent basis for the solution of social problems. For remedying social abnormalities the practical method to be applied is similar to that for improving the normal social organization. In both cases the true cause of the disease must be traced and the remedy must be applied at the source, as has already been explained. But in treating abnormalities science

has an added task to perform, and that is to distinguish carefully between the normal and the abnormal. A real disease or abnormality in the social structure should, if possible, be eliminated entirely, for it has no place in a healthy organism; but normal associations or activities which have become lax and ineffective call for stimulation or reform, instead of elimination. Our attitude in such cases and our modes of treatment may naturally be quite different from our attitude towards abnormalities.

This distinction between health and disease in a social structure may seem easy to discern, but often it is not. We have not yet observed and analyzed society deeply enough to be always able to recognize normality of structure in society. For example, it was assumed formerly that such phenomena as poverty and crime were social diseases, inconsistent with a healthy society, and that they should therefore be eradicated. Yet it now appears that to a certain extent poverty and crime are really normal phenomena and must be expected as inevitable by-products of social progress. If this is true we can never hope to eliminate them entirely. On the other hand, extensive manifestations of poverty and crime would be abnormal; and the attempt should always be made to reduce them to a minimum.

The improvement of the normal social organization and the removal from society of unhealthful conditions, are two of the most important objects of the study of sociology. But sociology aims at a still more difficult achievement, and that is to learn from a study of social forces how to control and direct human progress. Consciously to direct the order of social development, so that decay or degeneracy may be avoided and improvement may be continuous and cumulative, would be an extremely desirable goal. It would ensure a more rapid social development than has ever before been attained. Societies, if left to drift for themselves, may advance, at least for a time, as western European countries are doing now; but they may decay and finally perish, as ancient Greece did; or they may become rigid and stereotyped, as was the case with China. Why these differences in development

occur is not yet well understood; but it is to be hoped that, as our comprehension of the action of social forces becomes more intelligent, we may learn to avoid the catastrophes and to direct the processes of social change for the continuous improvement of society.

This objective of the study of social science may seem too pretentious and its pursuit hardly warranted considering how little advance has been made towards the coveted goal. It is true that the rate of progress has been disappointing, but real advance has been made at least towards understanding more clearly the laws governing the social order. So if, instead of rushing ahead to institute rash and unscientific reforms, we can learn to wait until scientists have probed the fundamental causes of social evils, our gains in the improvement of social conditions will be the more thorough and permanent. Furthermore, not only do we need the formulation of social laws by the scientists themselves, but we need also to draw the attention of the people as a whole both to the necessity for and the possibility of attaining a scientific knowledge of social laws. For it is necessary not merely to accumulate knowledge, but also to put the results of that knowledge into operation as opportunities present themselves. This last can be accomplished only when the people as a whole are convinced of the practical value of scientific information.

Precautions to be Observed by Students. A word of caution should be added to students beginning the study of the various social sciences. It is advantageous to start with an examination of existing social phenomena, and much insight can be gained by personal observation of social relations and by estimating the efficiency of associations and institutions. In making his examination, however, the student must learn to cultivate both care and impartiality. He must remember that each individual has his own personal desires and interests, that his early training may have given him a particular mental bias, and that he is subject to the traditions and prejudices of his class. In so far as possible, then, the student must lay aside his own personal interests and prejudices and try to view social conditions as purely objective phenomena, for only in

so doing can he obtain scientific results. The fact that the individual himself forms a part of the group which he is examining is an impediment to impartial judgment.

The student should remember, too, that societies differ greatly both in size and in composition, so that no absolute and rigid set of rules can be applied to all cases. Organizations and groups may function differently in different localities, and the specific needs of different communities may differ widely. Nevertheless this need for modifying principles to suit specific conditions should not prejudice the student against the value of ascertaining as far as possible the fundamental principles governing social relationships. If he maintains this scientific attitude in examining local conditions he may be able to make contributions to the fund of scientific knowledge by reporting, for instance, his conclusions on the types of organizations which seem best suited to particular communities.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Enumerate some of the ways in which the physical environment has been altered by man.
2. Do you think of any ways in which the environment should be still further altered?
3. Distinguish carefully between the physical and the social environments. How would you classify a steel mill? a herd of cattle? a source of water supply?
4. Enumerate some of the ways in which the social environment has been altered by conscious effort.
5. Can you think of further improvements which ought to be made in society? Why do we not make them?
6. In what ways do you think a better knowledge of sociology would help in improving the social environment?
7. Define sociology in your own words.
8. Explain the different ways that society might be profitably studied. What is the method of approach of this book?
9. Compare the study of sociology with that of history; and point out the differences and the similarities.
10. To which of the other primary sciences is sociology most closely related? Give reasons.

11. Why is it more difficult to make an impartial study of society than of nature?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Blackmar and Gillin, *Outlines of Sociology,* Chapters 1 and 2.
Bushee, F. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 1.
Carver, T. N., *Sociology and Social Progress,* Introduction.
Dow, Grove S., *Society and Its Problems,* Chapter 1.
Ellwood, Charles A., *The Psychology of Human Society,* Chapter 1.
Groves, Ernest R., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapters 1, 2 and 31.

CHAPTER II

FORMS AND PURPOSES OF SOCIAL GROUPS

In the previous chapter it was explained that sociology is the study of society and of the organizations and institutions which compose it; and we shall now proceed to analyze those various forms of association and indicate the purposes for which they exist.

Human Beings Desire Group Life. If we ask ourselves why men associate and why they form organizations and groups, we come at once to some of the most fundamental of the problems with which sociology has to deal. We cannot answer the questions by saying that association is merely the result of numbers, that people come to be so numerous that they cannot keep apart and must therefore learn to tolerate one another; because there was a time when people were not numerous, when individuals might easily have lived separate and lonely existences. Yet even then they preferred to cling together in groups as large as the physical environment would support, and they separated and migrated only when there was not enough food for all in the same locality. The truth seems to be that human beings prefer association to isolation, though sometimes they rub along together very uncomfortably and even quarrel violently over trivial matters.

Types of Associations. Light may be thrown upon the reasons for associated life if we analyze the nature and results of the different forms association has assumed. For this purpose we may consider first the simplest kind of association, that of the casual meeting of two persons in the street. When one person meets another each is affected in two ways: first, by the personality of the other; and, secondly, by the ideas which are communicated. If one of them has a particularly happy or jovial disposition, he tends to transmit his optimism to the other, and both are more cheerful. If he is morose or

sad, he tends to depress the spirits of the other, even though the latter may not be naturally pessimistic. Indeed, this reciprocal influence is so strong that we react to it even when encountering a stranger; and, though we may not speak to him, we estimate his personality from our past experience of others. Although at times we make mistakes, we are nevertheless continually influenced by the appearance and actions of others. In the associative process then, the first point to note is that emotions are easily transmitted from one person to another, and that we are therefore most eager to meet those individuals whose personalities are pleasing to us and are anxious to avoid those who are disagreeable to us.

The second point to note about these temporary forms of association is that, leaving out of account now personal characteristics, our social contacts are easy in proportion to the intimacy of our acquaintance. We are accustomed to the personalities of our friends, we know their mental qualities, their customary reactions, and the subjects which interest them; consequently, when we meet them we find immediately a common basis of understanding. It is not only no effort for us to associate with friends, but we receive an immediate stimulus from their companionship. On the other hand, effort is always present when we encounter a stranger. His tastes are unknown to us and it is not always easy to discover congenial interests. Indeed, there is likely to exist a slight feeling of opposition until some bond of sympathy has been found. This attitude results from the uncertainties of the situation and a suspicion that the stranger may be too unlike ourselves to be acceptable. When no feeling of distrust does arise, it is generally because we have already learned something favorable about him indirectly, or because he has been vouched for by someone we do know through a proper introduction. There are times of course when it is possible for us to form an independent estimate almost at once, and when, whether rightly or wrongly, we are immediately attracted or repelled by a new personality. But such quick estimates are after all the result of experience in judging character. The fact remains that association with a stranger, just so long as he is strange, is difficult. Persons

conspicuous for their social ease and grace are the ones who are most adept in discovering points of common interest with those previously unknown to them.

If we turn now from temporary encounters to a consideration of the more lasting associations between friends, it appears that these arise out of the discovery of mutual interests and sympathies which make frequent association profitable and pleasurable. Sympathies proceed from similarities in individuals; yet, while it is true that friendships are likely to be more enduring if the points of sympathy are numerous, many delightful companionships are formed between persons with some conflicting interests. Desire for companionship is so strong that antagonistic sentiments may be held in abeyance, or differences tolerated, in the interests of friendly association. Few persons suit each other in every respect; and, indeed, identity of sentiments between friends would be undesirable. Minor differences stimulate thought and should be welcomed, or at least tolerated, as a means of personal development. Only fundamental, irreconcilable differences need to keep people apart.

The particular benefit to be derived from a continuous association of two persons is the stimulus resulting from the contact of two minds which are similar enough fundamentally to permit sympathy and at the same time sufficiently divergent to provoke interest. And to this may be added the benefit each derives from the assurance that a loyal friend may always be counted upon for support and assistance.

The next stage in social life to be considered is association among a larger number of persons than two. As soon as the numbers increase, two changes take place in the character of the association. First, the points of similarity are bound to become fewer as the group enlarges, so that topics of discussion must be more general in character and the nature of the association becomes less intimate. Secondly, each individual has less opportunity to express himself, and therefore his interest is likely to be less keen and association comes to be less intense. The common saying that "two is company and three is a crowd" has a profound sociological significance.

The confidences and intimacies which two may indulge in are impossible among a larger number; so, in order to maintain their intimacy, two friends are likely to practice exclusiveness. "Just us two" indicates a sense of proprietorship and a resolve to withstand all encroachments upon a sacred relationship, lest a part of it be sacrificed. Exclusiveness towards others helps to strengthen the bonds between two.

Social intercourse in a larger group is not, however, an attenuated form of the type of association between two. It is a new kind with attributes of its own. Whereas the chief characteristic which enters into the relationship of two friends is sympathy, the new quality which is added in the enlarged relationship is rivalry or competition. Here the individual is no longer sure of his audience, as he is with one companion; at any moment another may prove more entertaining and draw attention away from himself. Furthermore, the larger company being more diverse is necessarily more stimulating; and each individual is spurred on to put forth his best efforts in order to gain the approval and recognition of the company. Conversation becomes more brilliant, entertaining, and witty than it can between two persons. Because of this stimulation many prefer the larger group. But just as friendship between two persons cannot be built on rivalry, so the larger association can never rest on complete sympathy and harmony. However closely the group may be held together by some strong unity of interest, diversities and rivalries can never be entirely excluded. Hence the larger association is of a fundamentally different nature from the friendship of two persons.

Larger associations should, however, be divided into two classes. First, there is the small group consisting of from three to eight persons in which the party can act as a unit on a common basis of equality. Secondly, there is the group of larger numbers which cannot retain the characteristics both of unity and of equality. It tends either to split up into smaller groups with the characteristics already mentioned; or, if it continues to act as a unit, it loses its aspect of equality and tends to segregate into the familiar form composed of leaders and followers. When conversation is in order, some

will do all the talking and others all the listening; when action is needed, some will assume the rôle of leaders and others will obey directions. These divisions will occur in accordance with the abilities and the temperaments involved. The large social group always needs to be organized if its unity is to be preserved. If the group is to be permanent, the organization resorted to is usually formal. If the group is intended to be merely temporary, an informal organization by mutual consent may be sufficient. Some structure it must have, however, or it will fall apart of its own weight.

Under these circumstances large permanent groups are seldom formed for social purposes alone but are organized for a definite objective, though social intercourse may still retain in them a subordinate place. Even in the large clubs established as headquarters for social relationships, familiar social intercourse is possible only among the smaller groups that always form within the larger organization.

In this connection it is interesting to note that groups of different sizes demand different social characteristics in their members. Therefore few people are equally successful in many kinds of associations. One person needs the stimulus of large audiences to give scope to his particular talents and becomes silent and preoccupied with a single companion. Another is brilliant in a small group but is intimidated by large numbers. Others, still, show extraordinary possibilities for intimate friendship but no marked social qualities in large gatherings.

Results of Association upon the Individual. After this brief account of different forms of association, we may now profitably consider the results of association upon the individual. The outstanding result, especially in small groups, is the mental development fostered by diverse personal contacts. These contacts not only stimulate the mental faculties directly but ensure those feelings of satisfaction and contentment necessary to their healthy growth; whereas isolation and solitude induce feelings of depression and cause mental stagnation. Everyone craves association; and it was this longing, rather than any desire for development, which was probably the immediate cause for association in the first place. With-

out it there would have been no society. Since the mental and social faculties can develop only through association, isolated men would have remained in a savage state. They would have developed no language, for there would have been no one with whom they could communicate; and, lacking the stimulus of mind reacting upon mind, no new ideas would have arisen. For individual development through association is always the result of a twofold process. It is due not merely to the passive absorption of ideas from others but also to the positive expression of one's own ideas. These two phases are closely connected, so that self-expression is determined not alone by suggestion derived from others but also by the anticipated effect it is going to have upon others; that is, individuals are so influenced by the approval or disapproval of their associates that they not only develop through personal contacts but they develop together and become socialized. It is because of this that the individuals comprising a group tend to have similar opinions and similar points of view.

The dependence of the individual upon the social group is what gives strength to the force of public opinion. Adverse public opinion is an indication that the individual is acting contrary to the desires of the group. The active disapproval of one's associates, or the fear of losing standing in one's group, is sufficient to make most people alter an unpopular course of conduct. Excommunication, that ready weapon of the church in the Middle Ages, was a very powerful one, because the church was so strong that its condemnation meant practical expulsion from the social group. Such threatened social isolation was sufficient to bring almost anyone to terms.

Although the association of human beings is indispensable to progress, it is not at all true to say that individuals were originally fitted for social life. In the early stages of civilization people were under the sway of instincts and desires which had for their object the survival and well-being of the individual concerned and which took little account of the rights of others. Only slowly has there come about the socialization of individuals, as it is called; that is, their adaptation to one another in the interests of the smooth working of the social

machine. Even now, after ages of selection and modification, they are only passably well adapted to the demands of the intense social life of modern societies. Man has been called a social animal; and so he is in the sense that only through association with others can he develop and realize his highest possibilities; but he is not social in the sense of being fitted for the life in common without undergoing strong disciplinary training.

The first and most important effect of association is, therefore, the mental development it enforces; but the individual incentive to association in the beginning was the pleasure to be derived from it instead of any conscious realization of the development which would result.

A second effect of association, and one which does enter the consciousness of the individual, is the feeling of support and security he receives through joining forces with others of his own kind. He feels himself so weak and insignificant in contrast with external forces, both physical and social, that alliance through formal or informal organizations with other individuals of similar desires and aspirations relieves his loneliness and by supplementing his forces gives him courage and confidence. This social support is the basis of the satisfaction which comes from belonging to a social organization, in contrast to the sense of loneliness which comes from ostracism.

A third result of association is the stimulus to activity and achievement derived from contact with others. Ambition arises out of the self-centered tendencies of the individual and his desire to assert himself and show his superiority over other individuals. This sense of rivalry is very strong and may be observed continually, not only in overt acts but in the course of ordinary conversations. While one person may strive to outdo his fellows in active achievement, or in the attaining of position and honors, another asserts his superiority when in company by subtle suggestions of his worth or even by obvious boastings. Rivalry, which in its crudest form becomes an unworthy and repulsive expression of egotism, is actually one of the most powerful of all the stimuli to progress. Without this incentive to surpass others, people would

content themselves with the satisfaction of immediate needs. The striving of individuals to achieve their own highest possibilities is essential not only for individual growth but also to provide a basis for the progress of society as a whole. While society should discourage the cruder exhibitions of egotism which, without solid achievement behind them, would cause the forcible suppression of rivals, the normal desire for self-expression in the individual, shown in friendly rivalry with others of his kind, should be recognized and encouraged for it incites him to the highest development of his own talents.

Social Purposes of Organization. The three results of association upon the individual, given above, arise out of his social contacts with others in informal or unorganized relations. In addition, formal organizations are being continually established for the promotion of specific objects, and these will be considered in later chapters. As a preliminary to their discussion, however, it will be desirable to give here the general reasons for forming permanent associations.

The first reason is that through organization more can be accomplished than by one person acting alone. Every individual possesses his mite of influence in society; but, when there is need for instituting a reform or for performing a permanent work, the combined influence of large numbers is essential for success. Individuals, when organized, act as a unit, which may exert an influence out of proportion to the size of the group; whereas individuals, when unorganized, dissipate their energies by failing to act together.

Not only are associations more powerful than individuals, but they are also more regular and reliable in the performance of their tasks. The individual has many interests and many duties; but an organization, being formed for one particular purpose, concentrates its efforts on the accomplishment of that end.

Another reason for organized associations is that they can conserve ideas and inventions so that these may be passed on from generation to generation. Of course ideas pass directly from individual to individual, but through the medium of organizations their transmission becomes more systematic

and regular, and also more widespread. If the transmission of knowledge were always left to the voluntary action of individuals, its spread would be desultory and unreliable. Special organizations, like schools, make it their primary object to disseminate it systematically; while other societies, like churches, also accumulate and pass on mental products as an incidental part of their work.

Associations not only transmit mental products, but they also act as selective agencies, retaining the best that is offered and discarding the remainder. This service is an extremely important one for the social welfare. All sorts of new ideas and theories are being continually advanced by individuals and even by groups; and it would be quite hopeless, as well as useless, to try to retain them all. Through associations of specialists, therefore, these ideas are discussed and subjected to criticism; and eventually those which seem to be true, or to possess the most value, are saved, and the others are rejected. The residue provides a definite body of knowledge, or of custom, to be passed on to the younger generation as suitable for use either by society as a whole or by particular groups within society. The selection is not always judiciously made and not infrequently absolute errors occur. The system employed is largely one of trial and error. Because of our imperfect knowledge, or the weakness of our reasoning powers, false ideas are often retained for a long time. But eventually imperfect or false theories again become subjected to criticism; and, in the light of new knowledge or of new experience, they are supplemented or replaced by others more workable.

Acquisition of knowledge is not then ordinarily the simple process of merely selecting the one true theory out of the multitude offered. Knowledge advances rather through the selection of theories or methods which seem at the time best suited to existing conditions or institutions. Theories accepted in any particular generation must necessarily, therefore, be looked upon as relatively rather than absolutely true, workable at the time but likely to be supplemented or replaced by new theories as conditions change. But the need of finding workable or relative theories is just as important for society

as the apprehension of eternal truths; and the method of obtaining them is the same. It is always through the subjection of competing ideas to discussion and criticism. This exercise of collective judgment is one of the functions of the association of human beings in temporary or permanent organizations.

Classification of Social Groups. With these fundamental purposes of associations in mind, we may now proceed to a consideration of the various forms of organization which have arisen to accomplish them. The different forms have their special characteristics; and they may be classified, therefore, according to the feature one wishes to emphasize. For example, associations may be small like a social club or a fraternity; or they may be large like the state, which includes all the people in a given area. They may be temporary like a recreation group; or they may be permanent like a religious organization. Societies may vary greatly in their degree of organization; that is, they may be highly organized like an industrial plant, or they may be loosely organized like a charitable society. Moreover, people may be united for social purposes without any formal organization at all.

Societies have been classified by Professor Cooley according to the intimacy of the association involved. Those in which the members meet face to face are called primary; those in which they do not come into personal contact are secondary. This distinction is important because to accomplish some of the ends of associated life actual social contact is necessary. Ordinarily small groups like the family or the school are primary; and large groups like the state are secondary.

A rough classification of societies, chiefly for purposes of illustration and reference, may be made as follows:

CLASSIFICATION OF ASSOCIATIONS, WITH EXAMPLES

ASSOCIATIONS

I. *Temporary*

a. Unorganized

Casual meetings of two

Continuous association of two or more

Formal association of a few

b. Organized
Trade Unions
Social clubs
Recreational associations

II. *Permanent*
a. Small
Family
School
Church (local congregations)
b. Large
Economic organization
State
Church

Although other classifications have their advantages, this system conveniently groups associations according to significant characteristics. It must be remembered, however, that these distinctions are only relative, and that an absolute line of demarcation between them is hard to draw. Size and permanency are both relative, but they are nevertheless significant in determining the character of the groups. The general distinction intended between temporary organized societies and permanent organizations is that the latter supply a permanent want of human beings, while the former are intended to accomplish a particular and temporary end not requisite to all types of society. A society for the abolition of slavery would be an example of a temporary organization, to be abandoned after its purpose was fulfilled. On the other hand, an economic organization in one form or another would be permanent, since it satisfies a continuous need for the necessities of life.

Characteristics of Different Forms of Association. All these types of organizations have their strong and their weak points. Some are particularly well adapted to some purposes and others to other purposes. An analysis of their outstanding characteristics will help us to determine the uses for which each is best fitted.

If the purpose of an association is personal, whether for individual development or for the pleasure of companionship, the group must necessarily be small and primary, since these

ends can be realized only through direct social contacts. For example, study clubs and recreational groups should be small, because intimate contact of the members is essential. Such groups need no formal organization; in fact formality would interfere with their primary purpose. When, however, an association is intended to be continuous and the membership is to be large, a loose form of organization may be serviceable, since structure tends to preserve a group and also to facilitate matters of business.

When an association is for the purpose of achieving other ends than those of social intercourse, formal organization is almost always essential, because it gives definite purpose and direction to the activities of the group. For example, an association like a trade union needs to be organized in order that the combined efforts of the members may be directed to a given end. Nothing could be accomplished if the group left action to the initiative of the individual.

The size most desirable for purposive groups naturally varies with the objects for which they are formed. If the group is for the mutual benefit of members of a given trade or profession, naturally it aims to include all those in that profession and no others. If it is for the purpose of reforming or reorganizing society, then it endeavors to include not merely all persons of similar beliefs but, by converting others to its views, to extend its membership to cover the majority of the whole social group. There are associations, therefore, that are definitely proselyting organizations, like a socialistic party; while others may be rigidly exclusive in their character, like a social club.

If an association is formed to satisfy a definite, recognized need common to all, then it attempts to make its membership all inclusive, or at least to extend it to everyone in a particular age group. Sometimes this inclusion is forced and sometimes it is optional. The state, for example, arbitrarily absorbs all persons within its area. The school system, since it satisfies a general need, even though not everyone recognizes this need, endeavors to make its work compulsory. The church also, which is generally supposed to satisfy a fundamental need of

human nature, still aims to reach everyone, though it no longer attempts to exercise forcible control over them. The family was organized to satisfy needs fundamental to the welfare both of the individual and of society, and usually people live in family groups; but this is through choice, for the state does not require them to do so, even though it may be for the interests of society that they should.

Large and Small Groups Compared. The problem of making organizations effective is most difficult in those groups which attempt to satisfy the permanent needs of individuals. These try to include everyone, either through one large all-inclusive organization, or through a multitude of small ones having little or no coördination. The state is an example of the inclusive form, while schools are small organizations with little coördination except for the limited territory of the city or the county. The family is a good example of an organization which is supposed to include all members of society in a multitude of small and wholly unrelated groups. Religious bodies have tried both forms of organization, and the Catholic Church is a striking example of an attempt to weld all its members into one solid organization, while "Congregational" churches leave complete freedom to groups and attempt no unification beyond voluntary coöperation.

The outstanding characteristic upon which the success of large groups depends is solidarity, which augments strength of action and increases power of resistance to outside forces. In contrast to this, notable characteristics of small groups are variability and powers of adjustment. The large organization can adapt itself only with difficulty to individual needs and local differences. The small organization can experiment with new ideas and methods, and so is likely to be more progressive; but, unless it has some definite central control, it is more likely than larger organizations to become perverted, or at least to go beyond the scope of its original purpose.

A strong central organization always tends to standardize its work. It makes rules and regulations which must be followed by its component units. While this ensures uniformity of action, it permits variations and experiments only when

they are authorized by the central director. For example, in France the universities are all united into a single organization with similar rules and equal standards, so that degrees indicate the same level of accomplishment. In the United States, on the other hand, each college and university is free to make its own regulations; and consequently degrees from the different universities with their diverse requirements may represent considerable differences in actual attainment. This latitude permits some universities to fall below desirable standards of scholarship; but it does offer others the opportunity to raise their standards above the general level and through experiment to adapt their work to local requirements.

The contrasting qualities of large and small groups are apparent in our federal form of government in the United States. The national government makes uniform laws for large areas, while state governments pass many diverse acts dealing with the same problems. This state of affairs does cause confusion, yet sometimes it increases peace and harmony because through this variety the different conditions existing in different localities can all be satisfactorily met.

Sometimes, where greater uniformity in associations seems desirable, it is nevertheless not feasible because of difficulties of administration. For example, family groups have to be given entire freedom to organize their work as they see fit, notwithstanding the fact that high standards of family accomplishment are extremely important for the welfare of society as a whole. Naturally under these conditions of laxity some families do their work very badly. But, while it is conceivable that society would be benefited if certain standards for household routine and for the care of children should be universally maintained, it is evident that families are so numerous and their attitude is so independent that any organization for the enforcement of uniform standards would be entirely outside the range of practical possibilities.

Another characteristic of the small group is that in it the individual stands out prominently, while in the large group he is of less significance, his personality being effaced by the size of the organization. Therefore small groups reflect the

strength and the weakness of individuals, while large groups exhibit the strength and the weakness of organization. Small groups to be effective should be made up of people of the same type; if they differ widely they fail to work together and the association is weakened. The reason that Protestant denominations are so numerous is not entirely because they profess slight differences of creed; it is also because the different denominations appeal to different classes or types of the population. Objection is sometimes made to these divisions on the ground that they are contrary to the ideal of universal brotherhood; but the fact remains that the effectiveness of small organizations depends after all upon homogeneous membership. Brotherhood is a sentiment or attitude of fair play towards others. It does not prescribe promiscuous intimacies, nor does it try to keep us from choosing our own particular associates. Solidarity of the group is a prerequisite to success, but the subordination of personalities is difficult; and members who do not become socialized, in the sense of becoming adapted to others, prove a menace to the stability of the group.

One of the chief virtues of the small group is that it awakens the interest and the sense of responsibility of each member, for in it each may easily gain the pleasures of social recognition; and if members are interested and active, the group is strong and prosperous. Therefore the aim of the small group is to stimulate its members to put forth their best efforts.

The large group, on the other hand, tends to relieve its members of any strong sense of responsibility. Structure is what counts, for the leaders do the work and the rank and file merely support them. What the individual does or fails to do is of little importance to the general result; so, though he may be critical, he is likely to refrain from action. This sense of unimportance explains the attitude of the numbers who refrain from voting in democracies. The casting of one vote, it is true, would seldom determine an election; but, if thousands of people refrained from voting because of the same feeling of futility, the outcome, whether for good or for ill, might be different.

Another danger menacing the large formally organized group

is stagnation. With unity the aim, all variations tend to be suppressed. To hold together becomes more important than to proceed. Progress through combined action depends upon foresight in the leaders and discipline in the masses. Just as in the army, so in any other vast organization individual initiative is confusing. The private must do as he is told. For this reason, large groups are much more likely to become conservative; and progress is much more difficult than in small groups where similar individuals have united for a given end. In fact large organizations are so little adapted to progress and are so difficult even to maintain, that sometimes the original purpose of association is forgotten and the organization comes to be an end rather than a means. Such minor activities as election to office, discipline of members, in a word "politics," may encroach upon its true functions. When leaders gain a control which makes them secure in their positions, they are likely to become arbitrary and rule for personal ends. The very structure which makes unity of action possible makes individual freedom impossible. The individual cannot free himself from the restraints imposed upon him.

In conclusion the point must be emphasized that in the large organization, in spite of its weaknesses, there is power and there is vitality. When it can maintain its purpose, it influences large numbers. The small group, however adaptable, must necessarily have a restricted sphere of influence and is much more liable to disintegration.

Although it is possible to enumerate the characteristics of different forms of association, it is impossible to lay down any hard and fast rules as to just which form of organization will best serve a particular end. That certain kinds of associations are better suited to certain purposes is of course evident at a glance; but there are fine problems concerned with degree of centralization and size of structure which must be left to experience. Moreover it is not at all certain that these forms of organization to which we are accustomed are necessarily the best, nor that, in the interests of efficiency, improvements cannot still be made in some of our oldest and most firmly established forms of association.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Think of a person whom you enjoy being with, and then try to analyze the reasons for the attraction.
2. Think of a person whose company you dislike, and analyze the reasons for this feeling.
3. Make a list of the different organizations with which you are connected.
4. Select two of these organizations, one small and one large; and analyze the difference in your relationships to the other members in the two cases.
5. Have you attended a large party or reception? Were you at ease? Did you have an enjoyable time? Compare your feelings there with those you have had at a small party.
6. Do you take more interest in the large groups or in the small groups to which you belong?
7. Aristotle said that man was by nature a political (or social) animal. In what sense do you think this is true?
8. Do strong antagonisms in society indicate that people are not fully socialized?
9. Is the existence of competition and rivalry a danger to society?
10. When a number of persons want to accomplish some purpose, why do they organize and elect officers?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Clow, F. R., *Principles of Educational Sociology,* Chapter 5.
Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization,* Chapters 3 and 28.
Ellwood, Charles A., *The Psychology of Human Society,* Chapter 4.
Findlay, J. J., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapters 6 and 7.
Groves, Ernest R., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapter 3.
Hetherington and Muirhead, *Social Purpose,* Part II, Chapters 6-13.
Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 10.
Rowe, Henry K., *Society, Its Origin and Development,* Chapters 1 and 2.

CHAPTER III

MODERN TRENDS IN SOCIAL GROUPS

The Trend Towards Large Groups. In the previous chapter the different kinds of social organizations were described and their general purposes and characteristics compared. All are typical and widely distributed; but some of them, because of the particular needs they fulfil, are more common in some societies than in others.

Modern society is very different in its character from ancient or mediæval society, and its needs seem to put a premium on large associations as compared with small ones. Not that the small do not exist—of course they will always have their place; but the large organizations have come to be so numerous relatively that they appear to be representative of the times. Many of the smaller, informal associations for purposes of social intercourse include greater numbers than formerly; and the large purposive organizations have increased in size with increased density of population and with the enlarged boundaries of the social group. This trend towards size is not merely a matter of larger numbers and more complicated organization; if it were it could be dismissed with a word. Actually it has had ulterior consequences in that it has influenced the character of individuals and the quality of social life. Therefore its significance requires explanation, and this explanation will throw further light on the nature of social groups.

Economic Causes of This Trend. Recent developments in the character of associations have been brought about by a profound transformation in modern social life traceable for the most part to modifications in the economic organization. Without going into details which would divert us from our subject, it may be said that these economic changes have been

due to two kinds of improvements: first, those in production; and, second, those in transportation or means of communication.

Improvements in production. Improvements in production are traceable to various causes. In the first place, new parts of the earth's surface have been settled and rich natural resources have been discovered and made available for human consumption. Then, scientific discoveries and new inventions have increased the quantities of raw materials available and greatly improved our methods of production. Furthermore, better management has perfected the organization of industry and made products cheaper through the economies of large scale operations. Finally, the labor force of the community has become more generally efficient through education and discipline.

As a result of these and other minor factors, wealth has increased enormously; and this wealth has been used in two significant ways. First, it has raised the standard of living of a large part of the population, providing not merely greater comfort and enjoyment but also more leisure and opportunity therefore for the accumulation of knowledge and culture. Secondly, and this is more important for the present discussion, it has permitted the growth of much larger populations. During the Middle Ages and later, when methods of production showed little change, the population of Europe was almost stationary; but from the eighteenth century, when improvements in production began to be made rapidly, populations in all the western countries grew enormously, and only recently has this rapid growth slowed down. Indeed, it continued so long that we have come to think of a high rate of increase as a natural and healthy phenomenon, and to regard a stationary population as a sign of decay. As a matter of fact, from the viewpoint of world history, rapid increases in population are probably exceptional, or at least not more than periodic, occurring merely as responses to sudden substantial increases in the production of wealth, and slowing down again as standards of living rise to the new level.

Improvements in transportation. The second great improve-

ment in economic life, the perfection of means of communication, has had a twofold effect because it has facilitated both transportation of commodities and communication between individuals. Better facilities for obtaining commodities have permitted populations to congregate in large centers, a phenomenon impossible without good means of transportation, for no city can be self-supporting. Even a country, if its population is dense, as it is for instance in England and in Belgium, cannot be independent. Food and raw materials must be imported, sometimes from great distances.

Better facilities for intercommunication, such as the telegraph, the telephone, the radio, printed matter of all kinds, as well as new and faster modes of travel, have increased contacts between individuals far beyond what would have resulted from mere density of population; and they have therefore unified and socialized the population over wide areas.

Improvements both in production and in transportation, then, have helped to increase both the size and the density of populations; and this increase has provided the physical setting, or the preliminary conditions, for the present form of social life we are discussing.

The differences between modern social life and that of earlier periods are in many respects comparable to the differences which now exist between urban and rural life, so there is no necessity for resorting to historical comparisons. These differences affect all forms of association; but we shall consider first the changes in temporary associations which influence the individual, and afterwards the changes in permanent organizations which are more influential upon the group.

Characteristics of Large Unorganized Associations. *Acquaintance is superficial.* In the dense population of a modern city individuals have intense social life resulting from many contacts; but, in addition, as a consequence of new facilities for communication which stimulate travel from city to city and even to distant countries, their contacts are no longer confined to a single city nor even to a single nationality. One's associates tend, therefore, to become more and more numerous as well as various; and those influences of individual

upon individual, so important to development, also become more numerous and diverse.

With the increase in the numbers of human contacts, however, their intensity and their intimacy have necessarily diminished. While we are acquainted with a larger number of persons, we do not know them so well, for intimacy with many is beyond the social powers of anyone. It is conceivable that we might still know a few persons intimately and a large number superficially; but as a general thing superficial and casual acquaintances have actually replaced intimate friendships. We talk glibly of the many friends we have, but if we analyze the relationships we must conclude that they are more often than not merely acquaintances or casual companions. We neither know them, nor do they know us. From them our more intimate thoughts and feelings are carefully guarded, as they would not be from real friends. The rush of modern life forbids us the time to devote to intimate friendships. Even members of our own families are often neglected. This lack of close forms of association tends to deprive us of any real comprehension of other personalities, and at the same time it deprives us of opportunities for self-expression. So altogether it is conducive to superficiality in our social life and to shallowness in our own emotional natures.

Association is formal. The old intimate association between friends has been replaced by large social gatherings which have multiplied until they have become an outstanding feature of modern social life. Having large circles of acquaintances we must entertain on a large scale, and this is inconsistent with intimate relationships. In large gatherings everyone is supposed to make himself agreeable to many persons within a short period of time. So his conversation has to be of a general nature, while at the same time he must appear to retain a personal interest and a sympathetic attitude.

The principle which governs intercourse among large numbers is that the more casual the acquaintance the more general must be the topics of conversation. Among strangers, until common interests have been discovered, conversation has little point. That is why weather and state of health as topics of

conversation have been worked so hard and worn so threadbare. It is assumed that everyone must be interested in them and so they are made use of as an introduction to more personal topics. The danger in the large gathering is that intercourse will never become more than casual in nature. The exercise of making small talk does doubtless develop valuable qualities, in that it enables people to meet new acquaintances easily and naturally; but the social graces it promotes can never replace those qualities stimulated by intimate association. Nevertheless we keep on trying to satisfy our social needs and develop our personalities by numerous casual contacts, just as we also try nowadays to educate the minds of the young in large groups by wholesale methods.

Under the present circumstances, then, the person who gains social prominence is the one with quick mental responses. Those with slower reactions, even though they may possess deeper emotional natures, appear at a disadvantage. Of course it would be entirely erroneous to give the impression that intimate association between two persons has in modern times become infrequent, or that people no longer have real friends. Friendship between two still is, and probably always will be, the most common form of association. Yet it does seem as if, under modern conditions, even this relationship had become more superficial than it used to be when the social circle was smaller. When friends are many, contacts have to be briefer. Moreover, owing to the mobility of modern life, we may be called upon at any time to move to a different locality and, leaving old friends behind, to form a new set of acquaintances. There is no longer much incentive to seek really intimate contacts. Indeed, seeing too much of the same person has come to weary us and we seek fresh stimulus in new associates.

To maintain that conversation had come to be universally of a general nature would of course be gross exaggeration. But when we do talk about specific and worth-while topics these are usually concerned with external events, such as business conditions or political changes. Yet objective as such conversation may be, it does reveal something of our personalities through our expression of interests or prejudices.

Nowadays a man's personality has to be disclosed through his assertion that he thinks business will continue to be good, or that he believes the present chief executive is a wonderful leader, or that he is sure his political party will win. All of us are willing to venture an opinion concerning such external events, but we are diffident about revealing any deeper levels of emotional life.

Forms of communication have changed. Another indication of the change which has been taking place in the character of association is the decline in the arts of conversation and of letter writing. In any period of history the prevalent form of communication is always the one most effective under existing conditions. So, in the days when the social circle was small and intimate friendships were cherished, the art of conversation flourished as the effective mode of influencing others; and letter writing supplemented it as the best method of keeping the bonds close while friends were separated. Later, when social groups had grown somewhat larger, oratory and public speaking came to be the valued modes of communication. When groups grew larger still, these forms proved inadequate; the newspaper then became a tremendous source of influence and editorial writing developed. Soon, however, even the news had to depend on striking headlines, and the very advertisements had to be based scientifically on psychological laws, to catch the attention of readers always on the run. Now, with the introduction of the radio, there will have to be a return to oratory, but of a somewhat different type—one which will appeal to an unseen and scattered multitude. The influential speaker of the future will be one who can work up an artificial inspiration when no audience is present to inspire.

The art of letter writing belonged to an epoch when means of communication were limited and single friendships played an important rôle in social intercourse. These intimate attachments not only drew out elaborate expressions of sentiment, but letters were often filled with opinions on current events or matters of universal import. Nowadays no one person is likely to fill such a prominent place in the life of another. Moreover, our time is so filled with varied interests that, even

when a strong attachment does exist, we never consider it worth our while to pour out our souls to distant friends. Notwithstanding the fact that the mechanical conveniences for correspondence have been much improved, letter writing has gone the way of conversation. In place of the old and choice compositions, we now dictate to a stenographer a dozen letters a day on practical affairs without imparting anything distinctive of our personalities.

Thought itself is more superficial. The immediate results of large associations, then, are that personal relations have been becoming more and more superficial, and the ideas interchanged more general in their nature. Indirectly this superficiality is affecting even the popular leaders of thought, such as public speakers and writers. The majority are satisfied to present, in pleasing form, such ideas as may be absorbed with little effort, feeling that it would be a waste of time and energy to attempt to evolve theories which would probably not be comprehended and might even be misunderstood by casual audiences. Leaders are nowadays so fearful of casting their pearls before swine that they have ceased to collect pearls. Glass beads are all they have in store.

Nor is this superficiality of thought confined to speakers and writers whose appeal is chiefly to the masses. It crops out also in what should be more scholarly productions for thoughtful readers. Serious types of books are too often compiled from borrowed material, or padded with superficial observations and defective reasoning. This phase of literary endeavor may be a temporary one, but certainly just at present an enormous number of books and periodicals are published, few of which have any lasting merit either in form or content.

If deep and serious thinking seems to have no place in a society where contacts are numerous and fleeting, the blame should not be placed upon the leaders alone, for the vast multitude of listeners are equally at fault. Both are victims of the changed social conditions. The mass will not accept serious thought when it is offered, for they lack the mental discipline and powers of concentration to comprehend it. Life as they know it consists merely in passing quickly from one external

stimulus to another. The ancient Athenians who "continually demanded some new thing" are not comparable to the modern Bohemians who continually demand some new thrill; for in ancient times people could listen to and enjoy a line of argument, while in the modern world they have to see a representation on the screen.

The average individual in the large modern city presents rather a pathetic problem in his search for pleasure. Instead of seeking for the meaning of life in the depths of his own nature he tries to find it in external stimuli, a search which is bound to lead to disappointment, to cynicism, and which, in extreme cases, may even result in suicide. Solitude certainly is the last thing which he can tolerate, either because he is unacquainted with himself, or because he finds himself an uninteresting companion. Any study of modern life in dense populations leads to the conclusion that it is abnormal and unhealthy, because it tends to divert the individual from a satisfying existence, when normal conditions should direct him into it.

Art is used to supplement association. Even if people under modern conditions no longer become so intimately acquainted with one another through actual contacts, they do still retain the wish to become so. The way in which they try to gratify their desire is significant of an outstanding attitude of present-day society. As in so many instances, here again they turn to the expert for what they cannot achieve for themselves. In the novel and in the drama they can still encounter the stimulus of association with interesting personalities, and they delight to lose themselves in the artist's portrayal of extreme emotional experiences.

Such a vicarious method of gaining insight into other personalities might seem to be an ideal solution of enlarging our knowledge of life, since it does have the advantage of presenting life vividly and impressively. Yet actually it has two serious defects. In the first place, portrayal of character in fiction is not always true to life. The artist, in striving for effect, may so distort or exaggerate his characters as to give a false idea of life and so mislead the reader instead of reveal-

ing to him the actualities of human experience. Herein, of course, lies one important difference between the great artist and the mediocre one. For while the master, through his power of sympathetic insight and the delicacy and truth of his description, depicts character as it really is, those less expert distort it, and distortion is as bad for the reader as ignorance.

The second defect in this habit of depending upon fiction for a knowledge of other personalities is that the reader remains entirely passive. On his side there is no opportunity for that self-expression so important to the development of personality. No literary portrayal, however inspired, can ever make up for the give and take of human contacts as a means of revealing personality; at best it can only supplement it. After all, it is those who have already learned to know others through experience that find the artistic presentation of characters most enjoyable and profitable.

Effects of Large Unorganized Associations. Before outlining the effects of modern forms of associations upon the individual, it will be helpful to repeat that the general results of association are acquaintance with other personalities and the development arising out of it, the pleasure resulting from human contacts, and the rivalry resulting from attempts at self-assertion. In as much as the first two of these results are particularly the outgrowth of the intimate relationships possible only in small groups, and the last is due to the more casual contacts of large numbers, in modern social life the tendency will be for people to be deficient in the first two, and, consequently, in the third also, while the sense of rivalry will be stimulated to excess.

Decline in personal development. The decline in personal development of the average individual, due to his lack of knowledge of other personalities and also to his own failure to express himself, leads to further social deficiencies. If he receives less, others profit less from him. He tends to become more and more like a machine and less like a human being. This tendency is commonly attributed to the extreme develop-

ment of division of labor in industry, but is really quite as much the result of superficial social relations.

This retarded development of personality acts in its turn as an impediment to the formation of strong attachments. The failure to form strong social ties involves not merely the loss of pleasure which comes from friendly intercourse, but something of much more importance to society as well as to the individual. It means relaxation of the bonds which make for social cohesion. Normally everyone should form strong bonds of sympathy and understanding with others. Friends form a bulwark of social support. With their counsel and their encouragement they tide over periods of failure and depression. Without friends there is a sense of loneliness and of isolation. Then, though multitudes may be about, nobody cares. Strangely enough, even in the crowded city the predominant feeling of unattached persons is loneliness. This more than any other one factor causes suicide during periods of discouragement. So important are close personal ties that social workers should take definite steps to build them up, so that social life may have a normal safe foundation. At present we leave social intercourse to chance, assuming that people will automatically form friendships; but this assumption has let us into a grave social error.

The growth in rivalries. In contrast to the under-development of these two aspects of association, and partly because of social deficiencies, rivalry between individuals in modern life is often carried to an abnormal and even ridiculous extreme. Instead of finding satisfaction for our social proclivities in the give and take of a small circle of friends, it is now sought in the applause of the multitude. To many such recognition is so essential, and life without it would be so uninteresting, that they risk health or even life itself to attain it. At all costs they must show that in one line or another they stand superior to everyone else. The most hazardous and useless feats are attempted in the hope of attaining notoriety, even though it is obvious that a fickle audience soon forgets.

So strong is this longing to be in the limelight, that games and many other kinds of desirable activities are perverted to

mere competitive uses. No longer are games played for the enjoyment and profit of the sport, but for the sake of winning and for demonstrating superiority. Indeed, we actually invent all sorts of contests, useful, useless, or even pernicious, in the hope that, in one way or another, we may assert our superiority over others, and that the newspapers will blazon our victory to the public in glaring front-page headlines.

It is of course true that rivalry among individuals may be a really valuable stimulus to achievement when directed to useful ends. It is only when the utility of the achievement is lost sight of in the competition, and rivalry becomes an end in itself, that competitive activities appear absurd. The extreme manifestations of rivalry in modern times result not only from the desire to attract the attention of larger numbers than could be included in a single group, but also from the fact that nowadays so many people fail to obtain social satisfaction from the more normal kinds of social intercourse. Society should carefully consider the social utility of its various activities before it encourages competition in them.

Characteristics of Large Formal Organizations. We are now prepared to consider modern trends in the more formal and purposive organizations in society. It has been pointed out in the previous chapter that such associations are normally large and well organized. Under the stimulus of modern social conditions, they, like the more informal kinds of associations, have increased in size and have also become more numerous. These trends have had subtle and pervasive influences upon our whole social life.

The individual is of little importance. It has already been noted that in general the tendency in large associations is to emphasize organization and limit individual influence. The large organization is impersonal in character; and the result is that in modern times the average individual tends to become a silent partner, or a mere spectator, rather than an active agent in great social movements.

In a small society individuals may start an organization for some particular purpose with only a few members; and all may have a conscious part in directing that society towards

the desired end and in modifying it as conditions require. But under the more complicated conditions of a large society, a similar organization, to accomplish its purpose, is likely to become an immense corporation, or a political party, or a reform movement with many branches. Such an association needs to be highly organized; and, while it must have responsible managers, the average member has little power over it. Indeed, the machine goes on from its own momentum and no one person seems able to alter its course.

While it is true that no one member seems to be of much importance, the effectiveness of the whole does depend upon having each keep his own place and accomplish his own personal bit. Nevertheless, an individual, instead of being a real force as he is in a small organization, is only a cog in a great machine; and with his loss of importance he naturally tends to lose interest and to forget his real responsibility. All this has resulted in diminishing the efficiency of purposive organizations, and it has even permitted their manipulation for the personal ends of individual leaders. The corporation is said to be a soulless body; and the passive attitude of its members has permitted the appearance in it of an enormous amount of corruption and waste.

Leadership is of great importance. On the other hand, competition for position shows a decided increase in the large association, for the reason that those who obtain positions of leadership are comparatively independent of the rank and file and they can manipulate the organization as they see fit. Its members are so scattered and so far removed from the center of activity that they are unable to keep in touch with it and to judge the acts of the leaders. If an organization seems successful in its chief purpose, such as a victory at the polls or the earning of large dividends, its members are unlikely to become concerned over minor policies of officials. The officials, in their turn, having once got control of the organization, will almost certainly be able to retain their positions or to name their successors, so influential is a position of authority in a strong organization.

Large organizations are not adaptable. While the large or-

ganization seems to achieve power merely through its size and its persistence, its very rigidity renders it unresponsive to any new demands and seriously limits its powers of adaptation to changing conditions. While all these characteristics are due partly to the nature of the organization itself, they are also due to the attitude of irresponsibility on the part of the members.

In as much as large associations are a permanent and important part of our social life, it is essential that they should be made efficient. With this end in view, the most evident changes needed are: first, increased flexibility of organization, so that adaptations may be brought about quickly and easily without endangering the organization itself; and, secondly, there needs to be fostered a stronger sense of duty on the part of all the members towards the organization, and a new feeling of responsibility among the leaders towards the people whom they serve. So rapid has been the growth of corporations and other large organizations, that they have not yet had time to become adequately adjusted to social needs. It would be desirable, then, to find some means to provide greater publicity for their acts. At least they should publish periodic reports, and these should be so clear that they can be easily comprehended by persons whose chief interests are along other lines. Increased publicity, however, would be only the beginning of the reforms needed. A method should also be found to register promptly the opinions of the members and to render these opinions effective in the conduct of the organization.

Large organizations tend to enforce uniformity. In addition to these characteristics of organized association, another, which applies to all forms of association whether organized or not, is the modern tendency to demand uniformity and even to enforce it if need be by law. A present-day phenomenon, which carries with it an element of danger, is our continual interference in other people's affairs and our attempt to regulate their lives and actions according to our own standards. We exercise this social control both through the action of public opinion and also when necessary through the stronger

force of legislation. Although in the United States we pride ourselves on having attained the greatest degree of freedom in the history of the world, from some points of view there seems never to have been a period of less individual freedom. It is significant that Europeans maintain that today there is actually less personal freedom in the United States than in most of the European countries. This lack of freedom is the result of excessive social control, and whether or not this control is the result of the size of the groups, the fact remains that in the United States associations tend to be on a much larger scale than in European countries.

Our modern society then stresses uniformity in thought and action, and its members have become accustomed to accept its decrees; so that generally people seem inclined to ascertain first how the majority think and then conform to the group idea. For the individual the only problem seems to be to find out what the indefinite "they" are believing, or what "they" are wearing. Now if it were merely a question of voluntary conformity, the situation would be less disquieting; but actual coercion has come to be exercised by social groups, who demand the maximum of conformity under penalty of social ostracism. Wide departures from the normal in such matters as modes of dress are corrected by criticism and ridicule, while diversities in beliefs and in actions are restrained by public disapproval or even by force of law.

The reason for social coercion is traceable to those ordinary normal forces which mould group life. It is the present exaggeration of the tendency which is more difficult to understand. Every individual of course founds his social life in the beginning upon himself as a center. Then he gradually tries to extend his own ideas and sentiments to cover the rest of his group; or, conversely, if he is a person of no particular originality or capacity for leadership, he attempts to adjust himself to the sentiments of the group as a whole, or to those individuals in the group for whom he has the greatest attachment. But the objective, both of leaders and of followers, is group uniformity. This social process is perfectly normal and to be anticipated; but the present strictness in group control,

which seems unnatural and unwholesome, is apparently an outgrowth of the large size of the modern group and democratic social relationships. If democratic groups do require uniformity for successful functioning, there is still involved the very delicate question as to just the right amount of uniformity needed for the best interests both of individuals and of the group itself. Although we have acquired a sense of conformity, we have not yet become expert in distinguishing the kind of conformity which means group strength from that which means suppression of individuality. We have, on the one hand, persecuted differences indicative only of harmless idiosyncrasies; while, on the other hand, we have ignored differences indicative of dangerous disloyalties.

The struggle for improvement. Closely connected with the sentiment for uniformity is the modern fashion for reform. This embraces the sentiment for uniformity but it possesses something else in addition. Conformity it still demands, but the adherence it urges is continually to different and higher standards. Continuous attempts at change are inaugurated by a multitude of self-constituted leaders, such as always appear in a democratic society. Failing to become generally accepted they strive to enforce their views and assert authority in a particular line. The result is a series of waves, or sometimes mere ripples, of social reform, some of which gather momentum while others soon die out.

Now the desire for improvement is most laudable, but our present method of attempting to achieve a finer society is open to certain dangers or defects. Like any other social movement, social reform should begin in the individual and spread thence to the group. The virtue sought for society must first be realized in the individual before he will be in a position to influence or modify others. But with our well-known desire for quick results we sometimes omit the regenerative process in the individual; so a proposed reform, lacking a vital center as a source of inspiration, may receive only a mere external and surface response, not deep enough to have lasting significance. The Oriental takes an entirely different attitude in his search for perfection of life, and he cannot

understand the continual activity and desire for change on the part of the Occidental. The Oriental aims at perfection in himself and troubles little about others, believing that each must find salvation in his own way. The Occidental of the temperate zone, with his restless energy and his democratic social life, is more objective; therefore, when he catches a glimpse of a truth new to him he not unnaturally attempts to illuminate all society; and he finds his pleasure in contemplating the social regeneration he has accomplished. The Oriental tends to become a self-contained mystic; while the Occidental becomes a radiant missionary.

Another danger in this campaign for the perfection of others is that when we have gained a moderate advantage we are liable to press forward to another attack before we have thoroughly consolidated our position. Improvements can only be made slowly if their acceptance is to be widespread, and society always needs ample time to become thoroughly habituated to any new régime. But of course the excitement of a campaign lies in the attack; and, consequently, as soon as society has yielded at one point, we storm at another instead of attending to the more humdrum duties of administering the reform achieved and habituating the vanquished to the new requirements. When occasionally we do halt to survey the field we are, therefore, grieved to observe that society has not really become so virtuous as we had reason to hope, considering the strenuousness of our exertions.

There is the danger, also, of setting the standards required too far above the average level of accomplishment; for, if the demands are too rigorous, individuals sensitive to public opinion will make a pretence, but only a pretence, of conforming to them. This policy, when pressed, can result only in confusion and hypocrisy instead of real reform. Human beings are not so easily modified in customs and habits as is the assumption of those reformers whose weapon is the law. Moreover, pretended submission of people to the force of public opinion gives always a false idea of achievement; and it encourages reformers to set still higher standards and to try to force progress still further beyond the capacity of average

natures. Such a policy can only result eventually in serious reactions which, in the long run, retard instead of assist true social achievement.

What has been said here of the dangers connected with the standards set by law, or enforced by any other coercive means, does not of course apply to voluntary ideal standards of individuals. These may be as high as our comprehension of them permits, and progress through teaching and example may well go on without hindrance; for appeal then is only to those sympathetically inclined, and each may make the response which he wishes. Danger lurks only in substituting legal requirements for voluntary achievement in social and moral standards.

In considering the number and the strength of the various social organizations and social movements, one wonders where all the energy involved could possibly have come from. According to the principle of the conservation of energy it must of course have existed before; so formerly it must have flowed into some other channel. As has already been said, when individuals belong to a large number of organizations they cannot take a maximum interest in all; each person concentrates primarily on his own special project. Yet, today, there is always to be found an inexhaustible supply of leaders for new organizations or new reforms. Now this modern social activity is coincident with the decline in family life; and one is led to suspect that probably the decrease in domestic duties and responsibilities has released an enormous amount of energy, which has found its outlet in the larger social field but is dissipating itself in scattered and random movements.

The Multiplication of Organized Associations and Its Effects. *Contacts are superficial.* Formal purposive groups have shown a tendency not only to increase in size, but to increase also in variety. This multiplication of large associations, many of which may include the same individuals in their memberships, has made life in the cities extremely complicated, as may be realized by a comparison again of urban and rural conditions. In the rural or village community the school, the church, the town meeting, and the lodge may

comprise the whole list of formal organizations. The residents, therefore, have no opportunity to belong to many associations, and in the groups they do join they are likely to meet the same people. In their organized associations, therefore, as well as in their informal social life, they are limited to a few associates. But in as much as they do meet these continually and in different relationships, they become acquainted with different aspects of the same persons and learn to know them intimately. Friendships, therefore, are likely to be more common in rural districts than in urban, but antipathies may be stronger for the same reason. One member of a small community may hate another in four separate organizations and be unable to avoid him because of the small size of the groups.

In the city, on the other hand, a prominent citizen will naturally belong to many more organizations and most of them will be larger too, so that he will come into contact with many more people. Yet, owing to the dense population, he may never meet the same individuals in more than one or two of all the organizations with which he is connected. People in cities know one another in only one aspect of their lives; it may be on the business side, the religious side, or the social side. If occasionally they do happen to be brought into closer contact with an associate, they are likely to discover surprising qualities in him, which ordinary limited intercourse would never have brought out.

The first effect of the multiplication of institutions is, then, that social life becomes so complicated that group contacts tend to give us a one-sided or partial knowledge of other individuals in much the same manner that informal social life does. These two phases of social life, the informal and the organized, unfortunately do not supplement each other, but both tend to show the same deficiencies.

Institutions are neglected. A second result of the multiplication of organizations is that the average citizen can no longer give his best efforts to any one of them. He may, indeed, exert himself to the utmost in his business, because there competition is strongest, his personal ambitions are centered

upon business success, and his social standing depends upon it. But his other activities are likely to suffer because he spreads himself out over so many. Organizations which are notably being sacrificed are: first, the political, especially those connected with local government, which the substantial business man has relinquished into the hands of the Philistines; secondly, the church, in which he now takes only an impersonal and intermittent interest if his relationship is not entirely vicarious; and, finally, the family, where the pressure of affairs has reduced his relationship to something quite casual. This attenuation of interest in all these various institutions has been most unfortunate for their welfare. It might even have threatened their existence if it had not been for the fact that there still remain a few people, however busy, who continue to give their loyal support to one or another of them. Instead of being carried on by a large number of active members who divide up the work, our institutions are likely now to be actually supported by the efforts of a few faithful followers. Naturally, however, they are not functioning as efficiently as they would if people's interests were not so divided.

Their relative importance has declined. A logical consequence of the multiplication of organizations is that their relative importance has declined. Not only does each organization receive only divided attention from its members, but the very object for which each stands seems to have become of less absorbing interest. A good illustration is to be found in our attitude towards religious beliefs. In the Middle Ages religion was an all-absorbing topic. Unity of belief was considered essential, and heresies were violently suppressed. At the present time we may not even know the religious belief of a club companion nor of a business associate; and should we happen to learn by chance that his views were so heretical that in an earlier age he would have been burned at the stake, now we merely dismiss the matter with a frown of disapproval and decide that he is not quite so sensible as we had supposed. This attitude of mind we are wont to call tolerance, and we pride ourselves on our broadmindedness. Really though, it would be difficult to decide whether we had actually become

more tolerant of variations in religious beliefs, or whether religion itself had not come to be of less importance and we too busy to concern ourselves with other people's views. For if we turn to another phase of life, which is still important, at least to the propertied classes, namely the economic order, we find that with them revolutionary economic ideas immediately arouse a storm of protest. The economic heretic, whatever his brand, is dubbed a Bolshevist, and he is likely to suffer social ostracism if not actual imprisonment. On the other hand, in a company of migratory laborers, or of hoboes, orthodox views on the economic order would be received with derision and contempt.

Public views on the state and on relationships between neighboring states are also likely to vary according to economic conditions. If international relations are calm and business is prospering, world peace and international good will are looked upon as rather attractive ideals. But if our national self-esteem has been injured, or the state is threatened, pacifist views are prosecuted as dangerous heresies.

The fact is that we still react violently to heretical views when they seem to threaten the existence of our social order, by which we mean our personal interests and welfare. We are prompt to resist anti-slavery agitation if we are slave holders, and prohibition propaganda if we are distillers; but we become morally indignant at the idea of any licensed sale of liquors if we have in the meantime turned bootleggers, and we persecute advocates of socialistic doctrines if we are property owners. On the other hand we are lukewarm—we like to call it tolerant—to dissentient views which do not threaten the social order nor concern our immediate interests. In as much as we have come to learn that society runs along about the same notwithstanding the great variety of religious beliefs, we can afford in religious matters a show of tolerance; though where divergences in belief are too great we can still on occasion work up a considerable amount of vituperation.

While, therefore, the general effect of having numerous associations is to reduce the importance of each, there still exists a wide difference in our estimates of the importance of

the various institutions. Those which seem most fundamental to our welfare are naturally given the most prominent places.

Summary and Conclusion. To summarize the foregoing analysis, we find that the increase in size of social organizations has tended to lessen the influence and the interest of the individual members, and at the same time to increase the strength of the organizations as such; while multiplication of the number of associations tends to diffuse the interests of the individual, at the same time that it diminishes for him their relative importance.

Many of these numerous associations are temporary organizations, started by people who wish to impose their personal views upon the rest of society. Whenever a new standard is accepted by society, then the individual finds himself subjected to a new form of social control. Lines of control are ever increasing, yet this increase must not be interpreted to mean greater subjection. For formerly individuals were much more enslaved to their leaders in certain lines, especially in the economic and political spheres. Now, serious oppression is less and equality has increased; but society does tend to dictate to all its members in a greater variety of ways than before and to require conformity in individual acts. The steadily increasing number of persons who break the laws would indicate that this control was proceeding too rapidly for individual adaptation to keep pace with it.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What is it that you miss most when you are separated from your friends? Is the need satisfied if you go into a crowd of strangers?
2. It is said that Mussolini prefers a party of four for social purposes. What size do you enjoy most? Give reasons.
3. What effect will the radio have upon large assemblies? What effect will loud speakers have?
4. Do you feel the strongest sense of rivalry with your most intimate friends, or with persons whom you know less well?

5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of uniformity of action in society?
6. Do you think people are too much alike for the best interests of society, or would more variation be desirable?
7. What are the advantages of attending a large school as compared with a small one?
8. Are the differences between rural and urban life increasing or decreasing?
9. Is it possible to have association with others too continuous and intense? What would be the effects?
10. Do you think that too many or too few organizations exist for effective social life?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Bushee, F. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 5.
Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization,* Chapters 7, 8, 9 and 10.
Hawthorn, H. B., *The Sociology of Rural Life,* Chapter 9.
Hertzler, J. O., *Social Institutions,* Chapter 2.
Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 46.
Wallas, Graham, *The Great Society,* Chapter 1.

CHAPTER IV

THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

Having completed the discussion of the nature of the different forms of association, we shall now begin an analysis of those more permanent organizations which are sometimes called institutions. Of these the economic organization is the largest and in some ways the most important of all social groups; and, because it satisfies a basic need of existence, it may properly be considered first.

Purpose of the Economic Organization. People combine into loosely organized associations for the purpose of producing and distributing the material things of life, both necessities and luxuries. Such associations are fundamental because they furnish people with the means of existence and, in addition, enable them to obtain those cultural advantages so essential to their complete development. Also, by means of the ownership of wealth or the command over it, people attain a certain position or status in society which may greatly enlarge their opportunities and broaden their lives.

Characteristics of the Economic Organization. *Interdependence and division of labor.* While some form of economic activity, or method of producing wealth, is indispensable to human existence, such a complicated organization of production as exists at the present time is not absolutely essential, though it greatly increases human efficiency and contributes to general prosperity. In early times, small groups produced wealth for their own needs, one group exchanging its small surplus of particular commodities with another group for goods it could not otherwise obtain. This primitive form of production has been replaced in modern times by larger units, some of vast size, each producing a single line of commodities with no reference to its own particular needs, but

with the intent of exchanging those products for the commodities which they require.

This specialized form of production, ordinarily known as division of labor, is possible only where means of communication are sufficiently developed so that products may be quickly and cheaply exchanged. This phenomenon of division of labor necessarily causes individuals and groups to be dependent upon one another for the necessities and comforts of life; so for the attainment of economic well-being there has grown up an unorganized association of producers, which is not confined to a locality or to a state but comprises in its huge network all persons dependent upon one another for the material things of life.

Absence of coördination. To the student of social life the nature of the economic organization is unique. Its individual productive units, such as those to be found in the steel industry or in the automobile industry, are usually models of efficiency; but the relationship between the industries which eventually exchange products, or between producers and consumers, is most casual and informal. Manufacturers controlling enormous resources are producing goods with little idea of how much will be sold; and some are even producing new kinds of goods with no certainty that they will ever be demanded at all, thus running the risk of incurring great losses. In modern industry we laboriously institute improvements in the means of production in order to save a fraction of cost, only to lose much greater sums through the failure of industrial units to coördinate, a failure which may cause a slowing down of the whole machinery of production. The perfection of organization to be found within an industrial unit is in striking contrast to the absence of organization among the units.

If we look for a controlling head to the whole economic structure of a country, which shall adjust and unify all its parts, such as exists in the political organization, we shall be surprised to find that there is none. In so far as there is any coördination it comes through the voluntary, sometimes haphazard, action of individuals or of constituent groups. Con-

sidering the importance of economic activities to individual and social welfare, it seems unaccountable that the huge machine should be allowed to run itself; and yet at the same time it seems marvellous that so unregulated a system should work as well as it does.

The probable explanation of this lack of coördination is that the economic organization is still in the process of development under the influence of rapidly changing material conditions. Its formal organization has begun at the bottom, so to speak, where considerable headway has been made in coordination among units, as, for example, in banks; but coordination has not yet extended to the top. The whole method of development finds its counterpart to some extent in the political sphere, where local governments originate first, and then are later federated into larger and larger groups. But in economic life, although the beginning of association among the local units of industries is becoming perceptible, no supreme organization has yet emerged which can be compared to a federation of states or to a federal government. However, the modifications which the economic system is undergoing now are very rapid compared with those taking place in other institutions; and, as it matures, consolidation may yet be effected.

Preponderance of individual initiative. Another characteristic of the economic organization which deserves special mention is that it is almost wholly made up of individual enterprises. Some social institutions are collective in organization, such as the state or the school; other institutions are private, such as the family and usually now the church, although all associations are likely to be regulated to a greater or less degree by the state. The economic organization must be classed with those institutions which are private and carried on by individual initiative.

Many people feel that the lack of coöperation so striking in economic life is the result of its private character; and they maintain that further unification would mean that it must become a collective or state enterprise. But it is by no means certain that a more complete coördination of parts would be

inconsistent with private ownership and initiative. In fact such advance as has been made in organizing industry has been achieved primarily through individual initiative.

To sum up the situation, we find that the noteworthy characteristics of our present economic organization are: first, the increasing interdependence of its various parts, through the existence of division of labor due largely to improved means of communication; and, secondly, the surprising absence of any conscious coöperation among the various industries or of any control over economic life as a whole; and, thirdly, its individual and private character.

Problems of the Economic Organization. With this explanation of the character of the economic organization, we are now prepared to consider the important problems connected with it. We shall discuss, first, the extent to which the economic system fulfils its purpose; and, secondly, the means by which the organization may be improved.

Before we can make any estimate of the success of the economic organization, we should have in mind the standards by which it must be judged. To formulate such standards we will consider what the economic organization ought to accomplish, first, in the field of production, and next, in that of distribution; that is, what kinds and quantities of goods it should produce, and how it should distribute its products among the members of society.

Ideal standards for the production of wealth. Our immediate reaction to the first question is likely to be that, in as much as commodities are desirable, they should be produced in as large quantities as possible. But, if the working part of the population should actually produce all the goods possible, the effort would so absorb their time and energy that they would have little opportunity or inclination to enjoy the goods produced or to develop their innate aptitudes. Human beings, it must be remembered, are associated for their common welfare; and, after all, social institutions and organizations exist only for the benefit of the members of society. If individuals come to be subordinated to institutions or sacrificed to them, then "means" are made more important than

"ends" and the whole purpose of association is thwarted. Production of wealth in any society, therefore, should not be pushed to the point where the exertion it entails interferes with the best interests of the producers. In as much as the welfare of individuals requires both goods and leisure time, the production of wealth must always be a compromise between work and leisure. It seems probable that, as a result of our tendency to over-estimate the material things of life, too much time is at present devoted to production of goods for the true interests of the producers themselves. However, as a greater quantity of wealth is really desirable, mechanical methods of production should be improved as rapidly as possible; but human energy needs more careful conservation.

The kinds of goods most desirable to produce should be measured by the same standard as that for the quantity, namely, the welfare of the people as a whole. According to this principle, a sufficiency of the necessities of life should be assured, that all may have the essentials of well-being; and after that comforts and luxuries should be produced to the extent consistent with the labor force of society. But within these general limits it will be found that specific commodities vary greatly in desirability from the point of view of human welfare. Some are indispensable, others are useless or of little importance, and still others are actually detrimental to human well-being. It follows naturally then that society should direct its limited productive forces towards the manufacture of useful commodities, and that useless or harmful commodities should be avoided. The reason that at present our productive energy is so often wasted or perverted is that the individual is permitted to be his own judge of his needs; and in making his choices of commodities he too often shows his ignorance or negligence of his real welfare. It is conceivable that the character of production would be improved if it were directed by a wise dictator or by society as a whole, though probably it is better in the long run for the individual to be allowed to exercise his own judgment and learn his errors by experience, than to be deprived of all initiative and made subservient to the will of others.

Ideal standards for the distribution of wealth. The question of how the wealth produced should be distributed among the members of society has received different answers according to the point of view taken. Those who are chiefly interested in the productive side of the economic organization, and are concerned with problems of its efficiency, insist that distribution of wealth should be made in accordance with the productivity of the workers. Those who have in view the satisfaction of wants and the personal welfare of laborers maintain that distribution should be made in accordance with the needs of individuals. They claim that the right of everyone to subsistence and to an opportunity for the development of his faculties should be recognized, whether he produces little or much, or even whether he is or is not a productive laborer.

This latter standard is criticised on the ground that it is wholly impracticable, that unless laborers are paid in proportion to their productivity they will lose interest in their work so that the product will decline, or many may even refrain from work altogether. Therefore, they maintain, in order to keep the laborer up to his highest pitch of efficiency, consumable goods must be used as rewards for productive effort without regard to individual needs.

There is some truth no doubt in both these contentions. If goods were distributed with no regard for productive capacity, it is quite possible that with the present attitude of human beings towards labor, production would fall off and society in general would suffer because there would be fewer goods to distribute. Nevertheless the logic of those who advocate distribution according to needs is sound in so far as they are stating an ideal. The purpose of production, and indeed of the whole economic system, is to satisfy the wants of people; and therefore an ideal economic system would distribute goods according to the various needs of the individuals composing society. Our present system of using consumable goods as a reward for production is a perversion of their real purpose, which is consumption. Production is a means, while the satisfaction of wants is the end of all economic effort. The

use of goods primarily to stimulate production, then, is an over-emphasis of means to the neglect of the greater problem of wise use of goods in promoting human welfare.

If a system of distribution wholly according to needs would be unworkable, as is very likely the case, some compromise ought to be effected between the two systems, so that the most fundamental needs of every individual in society should receive greater consideration, whether he is a productive laborer or not. If the ideal system of distribution according to needs is not practical, neither is the practical system of distribution according to productivity ideal.

If distribution of goods were made more nearly in accordance with their ultimate purpose, namely, the satisfaction of wants, the further interesting question would arise as to whether individuals should receive equal amounts, on the ground that the needs of all were the same, or whether they should receive unequal amounts, on the theory that their needs differed widely. A distribution of goods strictly according to needs would undoubtedly not be on an absolutely equal basis, because individuals do vary greatly in their aptitudes and therefore in their needs. In an ideal system individuals would receive in accordance with their capabilities to develop and to serve society. It would be ridiculous to give a moron the means with which to go to college; but it would be a profitable investment to develop, even at considerable expense, the special talents of the exceptionally well endowed. In so far as inherited differences in individuals exist, therefore, the principle "to him that hath shall be given" is a just one.

A system of distribution more nearly in accordance with individual capabilities would be profitable for society, because society would then be more certain of getting the utmost possible out of every individual. Under present conditions it loses much valuable human talent because of the extremes both of wealth and of poverty. An overabundance of wealth tempts some to dissipate their energies through idleness and luxury, while extreme poverty suppresses talent in others because of the lack of opportunity to develop their faculties.

Summary. The economic organization exists for the pur-

pose of producing consumable goods to be used in the satisfaction of human wants. Wealth, then, being a desirable acquisition, should be produced in as large quantities as is consistent with the highest welfare of the laborers involved. The system of production should be improved, and land and capital should be utilized to their utmost; but human beings should not be so sacrificed to the industrial process that they will be unable to live lives of normal development. It is better to produce fewer goods than to be unable to profit by those produced.

The ideal system of the distribution of goods would be for each person to receive at least that amount necessary for his subsistence and the development of his faculties. But, in as much as a system based on need only might cause a decline in production, some compromise should be made with the method proposed of rewarding laborers according to their productive capacity. Nevertheless, consumable goods will never fulfil their true purpose unless they are used to satisfy the wants of human beings in accordance with their ability to profit by them. It is to be hoped that economic conditions may be so altered that productive efficiency and the need for commodities will more nearly coincide.

With this brief review of ideal standards for the distribution of wealth, we may now turn to an examination of the actual working of our existing system and consider the means by which it can be made more effective.

The System of Production Is Relatively Efficient. Considering first the productive side of the economic system, we come at once to its more admirable aspect. The popular view that our system of production in the United States is ably administered and efficient is on the whole correct. We employ machinery to a much greater extent than most peoples; and we keep it up to a high state of efficiency by frequent replacements and by the introduction of new inventions and improved processes designed either to raise the quality of the product or to lower the costs of production. In order to further progress, many of the larger industries spend considerable sums for scientific research; and this has on the

whole amply repaid them by increasing their profits. Other industries, like automobile companies, have paid special attention to what is known as scientific management, and by its means have improved their organization, eliminated waste, and made their labor force much more effective.

Not only are our large industrial plants extremely productive but their productivity is highly elastic. Most of them could increase their output rapidly if the demand were pressing. The increased output of many of our industries during the recent war, even when handicapped by a reduced labor force and by inexperienced workers, illustrates the possibilities for expansion whenever a product can be absorbed in the market.

Defects of the System of Production. Although our industrial organization is capable of producing a very large quantity of consumable goods compared with those of other countries, it contains nevertheless many points of weakness which need correction. These defects are connected with organization and management on the one side, and with the condition of the mass of the laborers on the other.

Production is wasteful. Defects of organization are revealed in the existence of great wastage within industrial plants and by a lamentable lack of coöperation between plants. The wastes of industry, attributable chiefly to inefficient management, have been pointed out by many writers; and in a few cases sources of waste have been studied in detail. Both materials and labor time are wasted in industrial plants; but the difference in amount of wastage is very great between the poorest and the best plants, indicating that sources of loss are being eliminated.

Wastes arising from lack of coöperation are perhaps even more striking. Volumes have been written upon the wastes of competition; and these wastes have been specially emphasized by the socialists, who believe they can be avoided by the substitution of a more centralized system of production for the present competitive method. Under our system of independent and private productive units, managers do not know what competing firms intend to do, nor do they know exactly what the

demands for their products will be. Frequently too many factories are built to supply a demand, and consequently some have to remain idle or be operated only at half capacity; or too many commodities may be produced, and the surplus represents a partial if not a total loss. The competition of independent producers for customers scattered over a large area entails much duplication of effort to deliver commodities. The case of competing dairy companies is frequently used to illustrate this point. Competing companies send their delivery trucks over a whole city, whereas a single company would re-district the city and send only one delivery to each district with great saving of time and effort. A similar duplication of effort exists in the delivery of goods from retail stores, and also, on a larger scale, in the shipping of goods from independent factories to consumers in all parts of the country. Costs of production are also unnecessarily raised by competing salesmen and also by competitive advertising. Wastes of this type have been largely eliminated when independent corporations have united in a single trust.

Probably the greatest amount of inefficiency in our whole economic system lies in the sphere of marketing products. Ordinarily far too many retail stores exist for the most economical system of marketing, and unfortunately more and more persons seem to be attracted to this department of production. The only kind of coöperation existing among these stores is a general understanding that high prices must be maintained in order to ensure fair profits from a small volume of sales. In many cases over half the product goes to the mere process of marketing. Stuart Chase says that innumerable cases are to be found where the retail price is not twice but three, five, ten, fifty times the manufacturing cost and sometimes of the wholesale price.

Another source of waste arising primarily from inefficient management, though commonly attributed to the maliciousness of labor, is that resulting from the so-called disagreements between labor and capital. When these disagreements lead to strikes and to the closing down of industries, not only are large sums lost to the owners through idleness of the plant,

but the public frequently suffers serious inconvenience and laborers undergo great hardships. Whatever may be the respective merits of the controversies, they could frequently be avoided by a more sympathetic attitude on the part of the employers, or by the use of greater skill in handling masses of men of different social ranks and of different points of view.

Labor is forced into undesirable tasks. The other type of defect in the industrial organization has to do with the condition of labor rather than with the waste of materials. Industry has always tended to regard labor as a means rather than an end, and therefore to sacrifice labor to the process of production. This sacrifice has occurred in two ways: first, in the kind of work which human beings have been required to perform; and, secondly, in the long hours which they have been required to work.

The first of these evils is being corrected only very slowly, if at all. Laborers are still expected to perform tasks which are not merely disagreeable in themselves but are deadening to the sensibilities and are an impediment to the development of natural aptitudes. Ideal employment should be adapted to the talents of the individual, should afford him pride in achievement, and should offer scope for individual development. These requirements are fulfilled only in the higher grades of occupations, those which require special preparation and skill. The extended use of machinery and of division of labor has forced vast numbers of laborers into occupations purely mechanical, and therefore stunting to individuality. This situation seems to represent, however, an unavoidable stage in industrial progress; and it will never be corrected by a return to the old time primitive systems, but only by further progress in the present direction. For the use of machinery, when sufficiently extended, should eventually relieve human labor from disagreeable and monotonous tasks, and offer opportunities for tasks requiring more initiative and intelligence.

To many such an outcome seems doubtful at least, if not impossible. It has been maintained that the extended use of machinery would crowd labor out of the productive process entirely, and cause wide-spread permanent unemployment.

The past history of labor-saving machinery shows, however, that such displacement has decreased employment only temporarily. The lower prices resulting from its introduction have stimulated buying so that the labor has been reëmployed either in the same or in other industries. Machinery tends to be substituted for labor in automatic processes just as soon as capital becomes cheaper than labor in the market. The machine is the foe of unintelligent labor, because both compete for the same job. If laborers are restricted in numbers, and at the same time educated to a higher plane of efficiency, automatic processes in industry may be relegated more and more to the machine with nothing but beneficial results to labor.

It is to be hoped that both the quantity and quality of labor will in the future be such that further introductions of labor-saving machinery will be wholly advantageous to it. That it should be advantageous is not inconsistent with the nature of labor-saving machinery, as is shown by the fact that when improvements are introduced into a simple organization, as for instance the household or the farm, they are welcomed at once as a means of relief from arduous tasks. So if labor-saving machinery, when introduced into the complicated industrial organization, seems detrimental at first, this must be due to some defect in the system of division of labor itself and not to any inherent undesirability in an arrangement which actually lightens human labor.

Labor works long hours. The emancipation of the lower grades of labor through the perfection of the machine process, however, will be accomplished very slowly; and in the meantime relief will have to come from the second source mentioned above, that is, through reduction in the hours of labor. From the point of view of human development reduction in the hours of labor is as important as increased wages for all except perhaps the poorest paid laborers. Such reduction would not only relieve men from the strain and fatigue of excessive work, but would provide opportunity for development outside their occupations to those who could not find it within. To all workers it would offer more time for study, for recreation, and for that social life so essential to growth and well-being.

It is gratifying to be able to say that satisfactory progress is now being made towards establishing a reasonable working period. We are already approaching a general eight-hour day, and a forty-four-hour week, and the possibility of a five-day working week is even now being seriously considered. In 1924, the average working week of union labor was about forty-six hours. Something like a forty-hour working week would seem to be a not unreasonable balance between the demand for commodities and the need for leisure, considering our present stage of efficiency in the technique of production. But reduction in working hours must necessarily be brought about gradually for two reasons: the industrial organization needs time to adjust itself to the new conditions arising out of the eight-hour day; and workers must learn to spend their leisure profitably. The evidence shows that industry has been able to adjust itself more satisfactorily to the shorter hours than have the majority of the laborers to their new leisure.

Methods of Increasing Production. In as much as both greater production of wealth and shorter hours of labor are desirable for the general welfare, further improvements in the productive process itself will always be sought. Notwithstanding its present apparent efficiency, many possibilities for betterment are discernible in methods of production, particularly in the better coördination of parts and in the elimination of wastes.

Progress in technique of production. The spectacular improvements will probably come as the result of further inventions and their application to the process of production. The extent to which science will advance production and the direction progress will take are not easy to predict; but, judging from past experience, we may expect continued additions to our present body of knowledge, and, moreover, revolutionary discoveries may at any time be made which will increase immeasurably our control over nature. The extended use of electric power, possibly in the more intensive cultivation of farm crops, the use of radium, and even the application of forces not now understood, are cases in point.

Better industrial management needed. Next to progress in

science and invention the greatest possibilities for increasing production will be found in improvement in the efficiency of active business managers, of those men who undertake the responsibility of directing business units. It may seem that our leaders of industry and finance are already so efficient that little improvement in this direction can be expected; but such an estimate would apply only to the few whose achievements cause them to stand out prominently above the rank and file of business managers. The majority of those who undertake the direction of business are poorly adapted to their work. They are of the type that might be successful in a routine, but they lack the originality, the foresight, and the spirit of enterprise which are the prerequisites for executive achievement. Their mediocrity is evident enough in the smallness of the average salaries, and in the fact that sooner or later the majority of them fail entirely under the stress of competition.

To improve the average quality of business men would, however, prove a difficult task, because those talents which business success demands are probably largely inherited and cannot be cultivated at will. Real progress in economy of production would undoubtedly be stimulated, then, by a more intelligent adaptation of talent to task. Already the concentration of industry into large corporations or trusts is providing increased opportunity for such adaptation. These larger business units offer full scope for the talents of the most able managers, while at the same time they provide opportunities for persons of less originality to make good in subordinate positions.

Progress may also be expected from the formal education and training now being attempted by those schools of business which have recently had such a noteworthy growth. For while education cannot of course supply talent, it can develop inherent abilities; and it can, moreover, furnish that knowledge of the economic organization and that acquaintance with the most approved methods for the production and marketing of commodities which should be the required equipment of business managers.

The more intelligent business management resulting from

this education would make possible a better organization of industry, avoidance of wastes and losses, and installation of various economies, and would bring about an increase in the total amount of goods produced. Benefit would probably accrue ultimately to the consumers of the commodities also; that is, both producers and consumers would share in varying degrees in the increased wealth, instead of its being absorbed by the managers of industry alone. In fact, with a larger proportion of able business men competing, there is reason to believe that the excessive profits now going to the few would be divided among a larger number.

Improvements in the quality of labor. The benefits to production which would follow an improvement in the quality of business leaders would also be realized to a greater or less degree from an improvement in the quality of all classes of laborers, though it is in management that the need is most urgent. Better trained and more intelligent laborers, both skilled and unskilled, could unquestionably increase production; but the supply of labor for unskilled and routine work, and even that for tasks requiring more or less training, is relatively much more plentiful than it is for the more difficult task of organization and management. Without minimizing the desirability of superior quality among the laboring population, it may be contended that with labor the chief need is a greater will to work rather than a better training. Our present labor force could produce much more than they do, if they were not obsessed with the idea that it was contrary to their interests to do so. This fear is based on a narrow and individualistic viewpoint. So long as people need commodities the social welfare demands that they be produced as rapidly as possible. The unemployment which laborers fear is not nearly so likely to become general if costs are kept low through high productivity of labor, as it is from high costs resulting from unwilling labor. Efficiency in production leads to general prosperity and continuous employment. It is the high cost of inefficiency that makes jobs scarce.

One of the pressing needs of industry, then, is some system which will offer a direct incentive to labor to put forth its best

efforts. Many schemes have been tried, such as profit-sharing, gain-sharing, and the sliding scale of wages; but none has proved entirely satisfactory, except in certain specific cases. It is possible that no system of general application can be found, because industries differ so widely in character and in the requirements they impose upon labor. Each type of industry may have to work out a system of wage payment to suit its own particular need.

Increase in the supply of capital. A final requisite for efficient production must be mentioned, and that is a plentiful supply of capital. The importance of capital in the productive process cannot be overestimated. It means that the laborer will be given the best possible equipment for his task. His own feeble energies can be multiplied enormously by mechanical means, and his efforts directed with speed and precision to accomplish results. The advantages of adequate capital may be seen by comparing the enormous products of modern machine-equipped industries with the insignificant output of laborers equipped only with poorly made hand tools. Or the difference may be realized by comparing the output of the industrial organization of a capitalistic country like the United States with that of a country like China which still lacks productive equipment. Of course if a country lacks capital, that is a handicap which may be overcome by borrowing, but capital must be saved somewhere if industry is to be made effective.

Although capital is indispensable to efficient production, a lengthy discussion of the problems connected with it is unnecessary here, because in the United States lack of capital is not one of the most pressing problems connected with improvement in production. It is sufficiently abundant here to meet the legitimate needs of industry, though not, perhaps, to satisfy the demands of speculation. Since the war, however, the relative needs for capital in other countries have been so much more pressing than in our own, that capital has flowed out of this country in large quantities, with the result that the surplus remaining is no longer in excess of our legitimate needs. With our enormous productive capacity, though, cap-

ital will doubtless be saved rapidly enough to prevent any serious stringency. That it can be saved rapidly is an indication of large productive capacity, and an abundance of it is a sign of national wealth and prosperity.

That capital should more often be saved might be desirable, for such a plenitude as would ensure a low rate of interest would be a stimulus to production and would react to the advantage of consumers. But no general admonition to all members of a community to save to their utmost can be made, because the smooth functioning of the economic organization seems to require a delicate balance between saving and spending. People must spend to keep the machine in operation, and they must save to enlarge it or to keep it in repair. The amount of saving necessary for the welfare of society may be safely regulated by the amount which seems best for the welfare of its individual members. The welfare of the individual is much more easily estimated than are the larger interests of society as a whole.

Defects in the Distribution of Wealth. Turning now from the field of the production of wealth to that of its distribution, we find conditions much less satisfactory. If wealth is really a means and exists for the purpose of satisfying the wants and developing the talents of individuals, then a most casual view of the situation will make it evident that our present system is failing lamentably to accomplish its purpose. Economic inequalities have gone far beyond any possible advantage to society. For example, statistics show that in the advanced industrial countries one per cent. of the population owns one half the wealth; and that three-fifths of the population is without any property at all. Considering the large industrial centers alone, ninety per cent. of the wage earners are propertyless. Differences in income, too, while not so marked, are nevertheless great also. It is estimated that of the total income of the country, fifteen per cent. swells the coffers of one per cent. of the population, and that fifty per cent. of the income is absorbed by one-fifth of the families, leaving the other half to be distributed among four-fifths of

the population. Probably eighty-five per cent. of those employed receive less than two thousand dollars per year.

Figures need not be multiplied to show that the majority of the population in one of the richest countries in the world receive barely enough to cover their most pressing physical needs; and it is estimated that in the large cities of England and of the United States between twenty and thirty per cent. are actually below the poverty line. If this is the case, what, we may well ask, is the cause of the existence of so much poverty, offset by such excessive wealth, in a country with the enormous productive capacity of the United States? Why does the increase in the national wealth center in the hands of the few, leaving the vast majority to profit little, if at all, by improvement in production?

Explanation of the extreme inequalities of wealth existing in the United States, and indeed in all industrial countries, requires separate discussions of low wages and high incomes, for the factors entering into the two are not identical.

Explanation of low wages. Low wages are in general traceable to two causes; the one may be called individual, and the other social. The individual cause is simple and universally recognized. If a workman is inferior to the average of his class, so that his output is smaller or his service is less valuable, he will in the long run receive lower wages. Or, conversely, a superior workman will receive higher than average wages. Under trade union rules these differences may not be reflected in the daily wage, which may be made uniform for all employed; but when work slackens the inferior workmen are the first to be discharged, and when industry expands they are the last to be taken on; therefore their annual wage, which is the important consideration, is less than the average of their class.

Such individual differences are, however, only partially responsible for the extreme differences in income existing between rich and poor. They fail to explain the low wages of unskilled workers as a class. These are due to a broader set of social influences which center about the well-known law of supply and demand. This law is applicable to everything

bought and sold in the market, whether it be consumable commodities, labor, or capital. For example, if more than the average amount of wheat is produced in a season the price declines, and if less is produced the price rises. This well-known principle applies in a similar way to labor. If the labor market is overstocked in the long run wages go down; and if there is a scarcity of laborers wages will rise. The chief reason for low wages in any occupation, or for the small earnings of unskilled laborers as a class, is the oversupply of laborers.

In applying this principle of supply and demand, however, one should avoid the mistake of making supply alone the causal factor, without giving consideration to the influence of demand. Supply is always a relative, not an absolute, factor in the situation. If it were merely a matter of the absolute supply of labor, wages in the United States would have gone down as population increased; but on the contrary they have risen, for the reason that the demand has more than kept pace with the increase in supply. Nevertheless the demand for labor is not uniform; and it is not certain to continue to increase in the future as it has in the past. In as much as demand is of equal importance to supply in determining the wages of the laboring classes, its nature should be briefly explained.

What then constitutes the demand for labor? Laborers are used to produce consumable goods; and therefore in the last instance the demand for consumable goods may be said to be the demand for labor. Yet actually this does not constitute the immediate demand. We know that the demand for goods is continuous and seemingly inexhaustible. Why, then, it may be asked, is not the demand for labor steady and unlimited? Undoubtedly it would be as continuous as the demand for consumable goods if labor were the only agent used to produce these goods. But production is carried on not by labor alone but by a combination of four so-called factors of production—labor, land, capital, and business managers. Now production cannot achieve its highest efficiency unless these factors are combined in certain definite proportions. Take, for example, the factor of capital. Insufficiency of capital

must obviously impede production; and an overabundance of it, in the form of machinery or other implements of production, lessens its value, because of scarcity of laborers and business managers to utilize it all effectively. Applying this principle of proportion to the factor of labor, it appears that, while oversupply does not mean that there are actually too many laborers to produce all the goods that could be consumed, it does mean that there are too many laborers to be utilized effectively in proportion to the supply available of the other three factors of production—land, capital, and managing ability. Now when the labor factor is overweighted, wages will go down, or at least they will fail to rise as rapidly as will returns to the other factors of production. So, while it is true that the ultimate demand for labor is equivalent to the demand for consumable goods, the immediate demand for it is in proportion to the amount present of the other factors of production.

But, it may be asked, cannot all the factors of production be made to increase in the same relative proportion as labor, so that the demand for labor will go on indefinitely? The answer is that this is possible with all the factors except land, or natural resources. These are much less capable of expansion, though they can hardly be called fixed in amount since progress in scientific knowledge enables us to make increasing use of existing resources, and this has the same effect as increase in supply. The situation in the United States has been that capital and managing ability have kept pace with the increase in labor; and the opening up of new resources, together with remarkable improvement in methods of utilizing them, have kept the factor of land from falling far behind the others. But it can hardly be hoped that in the future increase in natural resources will keep pace with the increase in the other factors of production; and, if it does not, probably the returns to land owners will become relatively high. As for the other factors, the one which increases most rapidly, whether it be capital or labor or managing ability, will show the greatest decline in relative value.

In as much as capital and managing ability are variable

factors which can be more easily increased at will, any struggle of the laboring classes to rise to a higher plane of living, is likely to narrow itself down to a contest between increases in population and improvements in natural resources. History shows that in most of these cases living conditions have failed to improve greatly because of the too rapid increase in numbers. In such countries as China and India, the population has gone on increasing with little improvement in methods of extracting wealth from nature. Conditions would be better if the supply of labor were smaller; but they would also improve if the demand for labor increased through a wider and more scientific development of natural resources.

In the United States, though capital, managing ability, and the available supply of natural resources have all increased to a remarkable degree, labor, at least of the unskilled grade, seems to have increased still more rapidly, so that returns to labor have not kept pace with returns to the other factors. There have been two causes for the rapid increase of the lower grades of labor. One is the high rate of reproduction natural to the poorer classes, which, as will be shown in a later chapter, is appreciably higher than that of the wealthier classes. This phenomenon is universal and in most countries is the chief cause of the oversupply of labor. In the United States, however, another source of labor supply has had a powerful influence in keeping wages down, and that is immigration. In the past, immigration has resulted in sudden accessions to the labor market of large numbers of unskilled workmen at the age of maximum productivity. This cause has recently been checked by legislation with good results; but additions to the labor force derived from the high rate of reproduction of the lower grade of labor will be restricted but slowly, through gradual changes in social conditions rather than from direct legislation.

Explanation of high incomes. After this explanation of the continuance of low wages throughout the mass of the population, the reasons for the high incomes of the few will not need extended comment. They are, in brief, traceable either to the inheritance of property, or to the high earning power of special

types of labor, or sometimes incidentally to the action of mere chance or the enjoyment of special privilege. Property is inherited as an accepted right from generation to generation; and, since under modern conditions of investment it may easily be conserved from loss, it forms nuclei of wealth and power which grow steadily if nourished with care and foresight.

The exceptional earning power of outstanding individuals is traceable to many causes, such as discovery or development of new natural resources, inventions, lucky or far-sighted speculations, acute foresight in comprehending the trend of the country's development, or exceptional ability in the organization of industry. These may be called the sources of high incomes, but the explanation of high incomes is that they are the result of the interplay of the forces of supply and demand, just as are the low wages of unskilled labor. Labor of superior quality and intelligence is scarce compared with the other grades of labor; and efficient labor devoted to business management is scarce compared with the other factors of production; therefore returns to them will be exceptionally large.

Summary. The conclusion of the above discussion is that inequalities in the distribution of wealth in our present economic system are due to the action of forces which tend to form a vicious circle. Low wages mean low standards of living, these lead to inefficiency and a rapid rate of reproduction, and the resulting increase in population tends to a continuation of the low wages and the inefficiency. So binding is this circle that there is little opportunity for the laborer to rise out of it to a higher economic level.

At the same time, cheap labor combined with rich natural resources and capital enables acute business managers to make large profits; and these, giving them control over still greater capital, enables them to maintain or increase their dominance over industry. So, for them, a beneficent circle is created. Just as poverty breeds poverty, so do success and accumulation breed increased business and further accumulation; and this tends to the establishment of permanent sources of income from investments.

Possibility of a More Equitable Distribution of Wealth. If, then, conditions of poverty and of wealth tend to perpetuate themselves, can nothing be done to bring about a more even distribution of wealth? The existence of these vicious circles in economic life does not mean that the situation is hopeless, but merely that the factors involved would never of themselves tend towards improvement. Only by the intervention of outside forces can a vicious circle of cause and effect be broken, and a start made towards the forming of a beneficent circle. Higher wages depend upon greater productivity, greater productivity upon smaller numbers, smaller numbers on higher standards of living, and higher standards in their turn require higher wages.

Notwithstanding the seeming hopelessness of the situation, it may be possible to make the shift from a vicious to a beneficent circle by attacking the standard of living, because after all that does not depend entirely upon income but also upon intelligence. Education, then, viewed broadly enough to include all the social agencies which attempt to improve standards of consumption and modes of life, may be the effective weapon to use. Educational forces, brought to bear upon the younger generation particularly, will raise the standards of the laboring classes by giving them a clearer comprehension of those things which make life worth while; and this in turn will induce them to defer marriage until the new standards can be obtained, with the result that size of families will tend to decrease. Out of the new situation will proceed increased individual productivity and steadily rising wages. For when the same economic forces which circling in one direction lead to poverty are once started in the opposite direction, continuous improvement may be expected from their action; though strenuous effort may have been necessary in the first place, even involving perhaps the assistance of the state to start the change in direction.

Any gain which is attained through these means should never be lost by increasing competition through the introduction of a new supply of labor with low standards of living. Danger of this sort can be regulated, even though competition

of capital with unskilled labor will be unavoidable. To meet the situation the wise course is to encourage the free use of capital in the form of machinery to be used for the disagreeable or the purely automatic work, and to try to raise human labor to a level above the competition of capital. Labor should direct capital by its intelligence rather than compete with it for the performance of purely mechanical operations.

The process of improving labor conditions may be helped along occasionally by a direct increase in wages in many industries. While it is true that wages can never be materially raised without increased productivity of labor, it is also true that some leeway does exist in the wages which may be safely paid; and within the range of these safety limits payment of the highest possible wage would conduce to the welfare of society as a whole. Formerly employers believed that the lowest possible wage was most beneficial, because it decreased costs, thereby permitting competition and increasing profits. But business men are now beginning to learn that high wages are in the long run really profitable, because they increase the demand for commodities and promote general prosperity. Certainly it is much wiser to follow a far-sighted policy which will furnish a body of prosperous consumers, than to aim at immediate profits by impoverishing labor with as a result restricted markets due to the low purchasing power of the mass of the population.

If, then, the forces above outlined, consciously directed, would suffice to give to the poorer classes a larger amount of wealth, will this result automatically reduce the wealth of the few and promote greater equality of income? The increased incomes of the masses of the population will probably not of itself accomplish this result, because their gains will come, not from the present wealth of the rich, but from greater productivity. Other forces are involved in these reforms, however, which do tend to restrict excessive incomes. Better education for the mass of the population, and more careful selection of business ability, will increase the numbers of superior business men. The consequent competition will probably divide profitable business opportunities among a

larger number of managers and ensure at least moderate profits to a larger number of persons.

Conclusion. We may conclude then that our present excessive inequalities in the distribution of wealth are due fundamentally to marked differences in ability and to lack of opportunity on the part of the great mass of the laborers. Lack of opportunity itself is caused by low wages resulting from excessive numbers and the consequent decrease in individual productivity. Therefore the more equal distribution so desirable must come through enlarged opportunities for the masses and a careful development of all the talent available.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What are the fundamental differences between the organization of a socialistic society and of a capitalistic society?
2. Would it be better for society as a whole if people worked longer hours and produced more wealth?
3. Would it be better if incomes were equal for all workers and grades of labor? Discuss the advantages and disadvantages.
4. Make a list of the wastes of industry as it is organized at present.
5. Visit some industrial plant and report on its efficiency.
6. Estimate the number of grocery stores in your town or city and compare with the total population. Do you think there are too many? What would be the effect of a smaller number?
7. Find out the prices in a retail market of some common commodities, such as apples, potatoes, or beans. What did the farmers get for these commodities? Who gets the remainder?
8. Do you think the farmers receive less than they should for their products? Ought the retail prices to be higher?
9. Do you know any considerable number of very poor families? Are the families to blame for their poverty, or is society to blame, or is it a chance misfortune?
10. Is it desirable that some people in society should be very poor, and others very rich?

11. By what means could the various grades of labor be made more productive?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

BEACH, WALTER G., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapters 22 and 25.

ELDRIDGE, S., and CLARK, C. DEW., *Major Problems of Democracy,* Chapter 6.

FAIRCHILD, HENRY P., *Applied Sociology,* Part II.

MARSHALL, L. C., and LYON, L. S., *Our Economic Organization,* Chapters 9-15 and 18.

CHAPTER V

THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION (*Continued*)

Industrial Depression a Serious Evil. Even in an elementary explanation of the economic system another grave defect must be mentioned, and that is the irregularity and uncertainty with which it functions. The whole purpose of the organization is of course to satisfy the material desires of the population, and these desires occur regularly and continuously. But the economic system itself is subject to such marked periods of expansion and depression that, while sometimes the population is fairly well cared for, at other times it suffers privation and want. This irregularity is serious for it means not only that the economic organization sometimes fails to carry on its functions satisfactorily, but that reaction and retrogression may result. Improvements that have been made in the system itself and advances achieved in the position of labor may actually be lost during these abnormal periods; and the battle has to be fought and won over again, perhaps under different conditions and by different methods. Progress, therefore, is uncertain and at best it is slower than it otherwise would be. Periods of depression, or crises, formerly occurred about once in ten years; but during recent years they have been rather less regular and also less violent, owing in part to disturbances in the industrial trend caused by the war.

Our present problem is to ascertain whether anything can be done so to stabilize economic forces that they will function normally and continuously; or whether we must regard these fluctuations as merely another example of the rhythmic nature of all change, and therefore inevitable. They have certainly been too frequent and too extreme to indicate a condition of health. They suggest rather a serious disorder in the industrial organism which needs to be diagnosed and traced to its

source, so that suitable means may be taken to rectify it. Nothing of a similar nature occurs in our other social organizations.

Causes of Depressions. The disorder seems to be traceable to that curious feature of economic life already mentioned, that is, to the entire absence in an association of such magnitude of any central organization which will ensure intelligent coöperation in production. Under the present system small business units produce commodities intended to satisfy the needs of the population with no clear conception of the exact nature or extent of those needs, and an imperfect estimate, therefore, of the demand for their particular products. The result is necessarily confusion and miscalculation in production; and the only reason that production for the satisfaction of wants is not an absolute failure is that even by this haphazard system producers do learn something by experience. Now this experience might eventually of itself produce a workable system if society were stationary; but in modern times economic methods are continually changing. New inventions appear, styles are altered, and not only do new tastes demand new forms of satisfaction, but old wants are being satisfied in new ways, and new producers are continually entering the field. Therefore it is not surprising that even experienced business men prove inaccurate in their estimates of demand.

The result of these inaccuracies, combined with our present unorganized business methods, is a temporary breakdown, now and again, in the whole economic system. If goods could be produced in the exact quantities needed to satisfy demands, there is no reason to suppose that production could not continue without interruption. But when production has been excessive in one line or another, the industries involved have to close down until the accumulation is sold; so laborers are discharged and their wages are stopped without regard to the needs and welfare of the laborers themselves. This results in a further drop in the demand for commodities, so that other industries find that they too must slow down. Now the quickest and least expensive method for society as a whole to em-

ploy, when production became excessive in one line, would be to correct the mistake at once, instead of permitting the evil to spread to other industries until a general breakdown resulted and the whole situation got beyond control.

Better Organization Needed. In as much as industrial depressions seem to be traceable to a lack of coördination in the units of the economic system, the cure should be sought in greater unity and a more intelligent direction of the separate parts. Of course it is not certain that a more complete organization of the industrial units, or the existence of a directing head of the whole system, would suffice to adjust production to the demands of consumers. But it may be assumed that by these measures some headway could be made, judging by the industrial efficiency attained by the largest units, or trusts, through organization. These trusts, through control of a large percentage of the total output, have been able to stabilize production and to regulate the amount put out more nearly in accordance with the needs of the market. The smaller the business units and the larger the number of independent producers, the more haphazard will production be. But the larger and more centralized the productive units, the greater will be the foresight exercised, and the more accurate will be the regulation of the amounts of goods produced.

The desired regulation might be made by a government official or by a commission; or it might even be brought about by voluntary coöperation of industrial leaders. In the latter case it should be planned in coöperation with a governmental department in order to ensure its conformity to the law and to avoid action detrimental to the mass of the consumers.

Even though the demands of consumers came to be fairly well known in the established lines of production, maladjustments would always be possible still because of the frequent introduction of new commodities or new processes, as a result of the continuous search for added sources of profit. While in general it may be desirable to stimulate improvements in production, a review of the history of these advances would reveal serious losses as well as gains. For instance, goods are being continually put upon the market which find few purchasers,

because they make no appeal to consumers and satisfy no real want. Then the producer must sustain a loss, unless the goods are sold through misrepresentation or fraud, in which case the loss rests with the consumer. Again, many new methods of production are tried out which eventually prove unpractical, or at least too costly to be profitable. Considering the mistakes made and the losses incurred in individual attempts to further progress, it would seem to be neither unreasonable nor unprofitable to have a means of subjecting processes of improvement, as well as processes of production, to some sort of regulation or supervision.

Readjustments in Agriculture and in Industry Compared. Even at best, however, production could never be absolutely controlled, because so much of it depends upon chance or upon the irregularities of nature over which we have no control. No amount of direction could assure uniform production of food and raw materials every year, though better organization might lead to more accurate adjustment of the different kinds of natural products to the demands of society. One reason why the condition of farmers is worse than that of industrial workers is that farm products are produced by an enormous number of independent workers without any organization or agreement among themselves. So when a maladjustment does take place, as happened after the war, it is a long time before the evil can be corrected. Every farmer continues to produce the crops he is accustomed to, or which seem best suited to his particular resources, leaving all the inconveniences of adjustment to his competitors.

In the better organized field of industry a maladjustment in production is not allowed to continue for any length of time, for the consequences are more quickly foreseen. The industrial manager runs his plant on short time, or closes it down entirely, until the surplus has been absorbed. He can control the situation because he can discharge his laborers when their employment ceases to be profitable without assuming any responsibility for them. The farmer, on the other hand, does not throw himself out of employment to bring about a readjustment—fortunately indeed for the consumers. He con-

tinues production though in the end he may make little or no profit. In this case society does not suffer at all, and the farmer probably does not lose so much as he would if he had refused to work; but readjustment is not quickly made. In the case of industry, where the adjustment can be so much more speedily effected, it is the laborer who bears the chief loss; he may suffer irreparable injury from unemployment. But society suffers too from a further dislocation of the productive machinery through his unemployment. We are too likely to congratulate ourselves on our quick and effective means of bringing about industrial readjustments, and to overlook those less obvious evils which follow far in the trail of maladjustment, excusing them as inevitable; while, at the same time, we magnify an agricultural maladjustment as a calamity of national importance. Both conditions indicate, of course, imperfections in our economic organization and in our methods of production, but the industrial situation actually presents the more serious problem.

Possibilities of Improvement. If perfect adjustment in production cannot be hoped for, is there not at least some more rational way of dealing with maladjustment than by the discharge of laborers, entailing as that does hardship on the workers themselves and also upon the machinery of production? The situation is difficult to handle because overproduction in any particular line calls for both an increase in its rate of consumption, and for a temporary decrease in its production. But these conditions do not go together; they are, rather, inconsistent with one another, for cutting down production and discharging workmen cuts down their purchasing power and reduces their demands for commodities. Consuming power is dependent upon production because it rests on wages, which are paid in accordance with the amount produced.

Notwithstanding these evident relationships, our remedy for depressions so far has been to reduce production at all costs; but since we have done this at the expense of consuming power, our method has only tended to prolong the period of depression. If no automatic system of adjustment can be

found, it will probably prove to be more economical in the long run for society to continue to pay laborers over brief periods of stress, rather than to undergo the greater losses of long periods of depression. Just as banks in time of panic have found it wise to extend credit instead of withholding it, so society in times of a threatened industrial crisis will find it profitable to extend purchasing power instead of destroying it.

The need for such assistance is coming to be recognized in many countries, chiefly on the ground of the welfare of the individual laborers; and systems of unemployment insurance have been worked out to meet it. These attempts are of course encouraging, but the solution seems an awkward and expensive one. A better and simpler way might be for industrial plants to retain their laborers on full or partial pay, when production has to be temporarily curtailed. And a state subsidy, instead of going to a multitude of individual laborers, might better be paid directly to the industry concerned. Whatever the solution may be, some system should be devised to guarantee to the laborer a continuous purchasing power, sufficient at least to satisfy his more pressing needs.

Problems of the Consumption of Wealth. We have now discussed the economic organization from the point of view of efficiency, so far as the production and distribution of wealth are concerned. It now remains to estimate the result of all this effort by the test of whether or not this wealth is consumed efficiently. Commodities in enormous quantities and varieties are produced each year with the avowed object of satisfying the wants of the population. Now, how adequately or accurately are these wants actually fulfilled? The question here is not whether the worker receives a large enough return to provide for his needs; that has already been considered under the distribution of wealth. It is rather a question of whether individuals are making intelligent use of the share they do receive in the social product.

Under our present system of distribution, the amount that each worker receives comes to him first in the form of money; and with this money he purchases the goods which he thinks will satisfy his wants. In doing this he has to exercise a

two-fold judgment: first, in his selection of the goods themselves; and, secondly, in the actual use he makes of his purchases. Moreover, the selection itself involves two distinct problems: selection among the articles offered for sale, designed to satisfy his wants in general; and also choice of the desires to which he shall give preference.

Before discussing the character of the purchases made, it will be interesting to note certain assumptions which underlie our theories of consumption of wealth, and to consider to what extent they apply to actual conditions. One assumption is that every consumer understands his own needs and is perfectly capable of satisfying them properly if only he has the means. This assumption implies a knowledge and intelligence on the part of the average individual not manifest in the purchases he actually makes. Again, we make another attractive assumption that there exists a sort of hierarchy of human desires. We take for granted that man has certain physical needs which are cared for within the family group, and that after these physical demands are satisfied he will spend something for recreation and social life, and that then, as his means permit, he will proceed to develop his higher faculties along intellectual and esthetic lines. While such a hierarchy might be ideal, any analysis of actual expenditures indicates either that man cares little for that abstract thing which we call his well-being, or else that his comprehension of it is very imperfect.

Of all the standards which have been used for estimating the character of individuals, one of the most accurate is the way in which they spend their incomes, because that shows their preferences in the satisfaction of desires. Expenditures of wealth do not indicate that the average consumer presses forward to the development of his cultural needs as soon as his physical wants are cared for. He tends rather to court the refinements of physical pleasures, seemingly forgetful of the benefits and the satisfaction to be found in the cultivation of the intellect.

Problem of the Selection of Specific Commodities. *Consumers are unintelligent buyers.* Of the two problems of

the consumption of wealth, the simpler one is that concerned with the selection of specific articles; and in this department of consumption it appears that, although people do generally succeed in satisfying their needs, their purchases are frequently made with little care and foresight. We all often make purchases without knowing exactly what we need; and even when we do understand our needs, we are likely to exercise little discrimination or judgment in our selection of specific articles. In contrast to the effort used in the production of goods, and in the attainment of an income, expenditure is haphazard and wasteful.

Consider first as purchasers the poorest grade of regular laborers. They have not, to be sure, any intellectual training which would make them discriminating buyers, but they work hard for an income which barely suffices for the physical needs of their families; and, therefore, it might be assumed that they would make every effort to spend their meagre earnings with the greatest care and economy. Yet quite the contrary seems to be the case. Having little intelligence, they exercise little judgment in making their purchases. To feed their children they buy cabbage and beans instead of milk. In selecting meats they buy the cheapest cuts per pound, which are usually the most expensive as far as food values are concerned. Uniformly they buy in such small quantities that they are continually at a disadvantage. In other words, they show no ability whatever in buying the maximum of nourishment at the minimum cost. Other classes may waste more of what they do buy, but no class is more uneconomical than they are in the original purchase. In the matter of housing they are equally careless. They are inclined to accept any tenement which happens to be vacant, with no attempt to discover if it is the best available for the money. For instance, in a study I made of Boston tenements it appeared that, when a number of inferior tenement houses were torn down and the families forced to move, all were able to find better accommodations at no increase of price, and some at a lower price; and all of these better accommodations could have been found in the first place if any intelligent search had been made.

Finally, any surplus over bare necessities which the poor may be able to accumulate is usually spent with a similar disregard for their best interests. It is notorious that the very poor are as likely to spend their surplus on such a luxury as an elaborate funeral, which shall be the talk of the neighborhood, as they are to purchase physical necessities, which would obviate the necessity for such frequent funerals.

Turning to the better paid classes, we find that their buying is on the whole more intelligently done, though many of their expenditures still show a surprising lack of foresight. The majority tend to buy articles which strike their fancy at the moment, without weighing their real value or estimating their permanent power to satisfy wants. We all know how easy it is to disregard our reason and accept the suggestions of clever salesmen, or even to submit to enticing advertisements. However much we may pride ourselves on our foresight, we do frequently spend for momentary pleasures, or buy commodities of ephemeral interest. We spend days in acquiring money, and minutes in spending it. The continual purchase of useless articles is ordinarily regarded as of little importance. The purchaser excuses his lapses of judgment and determines to avoid them another time; and society tolerates them on the ground that money is thereby passing from more foolish to more intelligent hands. But the consequences of the evil are twofold. On the one hand the individual is not getting the utility he should from his income, for his needs are not being properly satisfied; and on the other hand, what is more serious, unintelligent buying diverts production from its proper channels. Producers intent on profit are encouraged to continue to furnish useless, or at least unsatisfactory, articles, which are forced on the consumer through the power of suggestion, when they should be engaged in the production of commodities possessing an enduring value.

They purchase goods of poor quality. Besides this tendency to purchase commodities poorly adapted to their needs, consumers show an obvious lack of ability to estimate the quality and serviceableness of the things they do need. Only the few superior shoppers have the knowledge with which to estimate

commodities. The majority purchase by chance or accept the recommendations of the salesmen. Schools of home economics are, to be sure, teaching their pupils the nutritive values of foods and the utilities of different kinds of cloths; but this knowledge is not general. Purchasers are kept from serious disaster because of the keen competition among producers, which has finally tended to put a premium on honesty. Many firms are seeking patronage by producing quality goods and are earning the confidence of the public by giving reliable information. While this development has protected the interests of consumers considerably, the necessity for the exercise of personal judgment can never be dispensed with. Advice from the producer can seldom be impartial, nor can the salesman always understand the needs of the consumer as well as can the consumer himself. However honest a salesman may be, his primary object is to sell, and he is naturally predisposed in favor of his own goods. Greater skill in purchasing would enable consumers to get much more utility from their earnings.

The effect upon prices. Another result of careless buying is that purchasers frequently have to pay more than competitive prices. Though this is one of the lesser evils, yet it has far-reaching effects. Realizing the casual way in which purchases are made, and relying on the ignorance of their clientele, dealers are tempted to charge much more than free competition would permit. Purchasers are inclined to limit themselves to a few favorite stores without any idea of what can be obtained elsewhere, relying upon the honesty and enterprise of their favorite establishments for fair prices as well as for quality and service. Such reliance is not always well placed. Imperfect competition in marketing, with its consequent wide variation in retail prices, is due as much to the sluggishness of purchasers as to the rapacity and inefficiency of dealers. Greater alertness on the part of buyers would force greater uniformity of prices among sellers. But just as long as consumers are governed in their buying by habit and custom, prices will never be entirely competitive.

Summary. A study of the consumption of wealth shows

that it is the least developed part of our economic system. We have become trained experts in producing and selling, but we are still amateurs in buying. Competition has worked effectively to improve the system of producing goods but has had little effect on methods of purchasing them. The welfare of the consumer has been constantly ignored. A rift seems to exist in the economic organization between production and consumption, whereas the two should be absolutely coördinated. Of course producers cannot altogether ignore the needs of consumers; but a tendency is apparent, nevertheless, to produce goods for the purpose of selling them rather than for satisfying real needs. Selling is based too often on the passivity and helplessness of consumers, and independent judgment on their part is not encouraged. Advertising would lose much of its potency if consumers should suddenly become rational beings.

Preferences in the Desires Gratified. Leaving now the subject of the purchase of specific commodities, we may consider next the more difficult problem of the preferences exhibited by purchasers in the satisfaction of desires.

The satisfaction of physical needs. It goes without saying that all classes will first satisfy those needs which ensure the preservation of life, simply because they would suffer so much pain and inconvenience if they did not. But even in fulfilling these basic desires, the majority seem to be swayed solely by their sensations and to attempt to avoid pain or stimulate pleasure, instead of pursuing a constructive course for the preservation of their health and the conservation of their energy. The consumption of those commodities which give immediate pleasure but may entail ultimate suffering is so common an occurrence as scarcely to arouse comment. But choice of commodities for the deliberate purpose of providing for the physical well-being that nature intended would necessitate more intelligent comprehension of physical needs themselves and a much greater exercise of self-control than is often displayed. Although the pursuit of pleasure may not be a philosophical ideal, it is the practical objective for the mass of the population. This fact in itself is not so surprising, but

the selection that is generally made among the pleasures available and the means used in satisfying them offer grave food for thought.

If we acted like intelligent beings we should, after satisfying primary physical needs, turn to the gratification of intellectual interests; but we are inclined to linger longingly over physical sensations instead. People eat more than they should for the passing pleasure of it, they prefer the food and drink which will give the greatest momentary pleasure without regard to its effect upon health, and they try to soothe their nerves with the use of tobacco. Even social life is linked up with the pleasures of eating. The tongue is a little member, but it is the instrument of our chief pleasures and the mainspring of our social life. To taste and to talk are our most common gratifications. The higher and more complicated pleasures of hearing and seeing are less fully developed and less frequently used.

Social rivalries are of great importance. After the satisfaction of physical needs, expenditures seem to be directed to the satisfaction of social pleasures more often than to the development of mental life. The existence of excessive competition and keen rivalry in social life has already been explained; and any analysis of expenditures merely makes more evident the desire for social prominence. Everyone wishes to equal at least the standards of his neighbors, and, if possible, to surpass them in one way or another. The full significance of expenditures for this purpose is not fully realized, because they are bound up frequently in outlays for other things. We must all have shelter and clothing; but upon the type of our house, and the quality of our clothing, depends not merely our comfort but also our social standing. Expenditures for the commonest needs, then, are so greatly affected by social rivalry that we usually spend much more on them than we otherwise would. But we also spend freely for objects which do not cater solely to the gratification of our personal desires. These expenditures are imitative, made because of the need of conforming to the accepted social standards lest we suffer social eclipse. Without taking into account this social emula-

tion, it is impossible to explain the ever-passing waves of style. Fashions, whether they be in furniture, or clothing, or even in particular games, are all liable to change; and expenditures continually conform to the new styles. Even the widespread ownership of such a useful article as an automobile can hardly be explained from the viewpoint of utility alone. Many buy machines simply because it is the thing to do and they feel that they cannot afford to fall behind their neighbors. Soon it comes to be not merely the acquisition of a car that is necessary in order to keep the pace, but the ownership of a particular grade of car.

The desire for social recognition, which influences even the expenditures for necessities among the poor and is liable to increase expenditures for luxuries in the middle class, often incites the rich to conspicuous expenditures of enormous amounts. Household decorations and furnishings are purchased without regard to cost, though the chief gratification derived from them is the feeling that they are the best to be had. Extravagant entertainments have for their chief purpose to convey an impression of lavishness and grandeur beyond ordinary attainment. The enormous sums spent on jewelry and all forms of personal decoration are almost entirely expenditures for social rivalry. Even donations for charities, or other public benefits, are not entirely uninfluenced by the opinions of others. However uncommunicative a donor himself may be about his gift, should a reporter happen to learn of his generosity and publish it to the world, he is able to console himself with the realization that the publicity will serve to stimulate others to emulate his public-spirited example. But most large gifts are of course openly made. One of the most popular forms of philanthropy is the gift of a building which shall bear the name of the donor and remain a permanent witness to his generosity.

As we have seen, this sensitiveness to the opinions of others is not confined to any particular class; but, if its aspect is most blatant where wealth is excessive, it is most pathetic where resources are most limited. Young people from poor homes, and especially working girls dependent upon their own earn-

ings, will deprive themselves of comforts and even necessities in order to buy clothing which conforms to the standards of the well-to-do and so enables them to make a favorable appearance in public. In such cases, no thought of superiority to others can be involved. It is merely a question of conforming, of being inconspicuous, in the presence of others. This universal craving for social standing accounts for the production of cheap imitations of the styles worn by the prosperous members of the community. And, here again in the character of our expenditures for social recognition, we see, from another point of view, the application of the principle laid down in a previous chapter, that in large groups the pressure of social uniformity works more powerfully than it does in small groups, and social rivalries become exceedingly keen.

The satisfaction of intellectual needs. Expenditures for the satisfaction of intellectual needs are more difficult to appraise, because so many cultural products are supplied publicly, either free of charge or at a small fraction of the original cost.

Books, for instance, are supplied free of charge in public libraries, and the demand for them is gratifying; though an analysis of this demand reveals, judging by the popularity of light fiction, that too often the end sought is not mental stimulus but emotional excitement.

Museums filled with the finest products of art are available for the education of the public; but, even when admission to these collections is free, patronage by the general public is never more than moderate, while attendance at historical and scientific museums is even less general. The purchase of rare and expensive works of art would not of course be possible for the average consumer; but where the cost is not prohibitive the amount spent for books, pictures, and other works of art is considerable. On the other hand, statistics of civilized societies show that consumers spend a much greater proportion of their incomes on cosmetics, cigarettes, and chewing gum.

Music and the drama seem to be the most popular of all the forms of intellectual diversions. But the most popular dramatic productions are similar in character to the type of books most in demand; they are designed to furnish amuse-

ment or to stimulate the emotions, but they afford little real intellectual sustenance.

Even higher education is now furnished free of charge; though, in as much as the cost of living is always considerable, an education is never obtained without some sacrifice by those with small incomes. Educational opportunities are regarded from many points of view. The majority of the population, for various reasons, still refuse to attend schools longer than is required by the state. Within recent years, however, the number demanding a higher education has increased to a remarkable degree; and this would be a very encouraging sign if it appeared that the larger numbers were seeking knowledge and culture for their own sakes. But apparently the majority regard education merely as an instrument to aid in the attainment of business success and social position rather than as a means of developing the higher faculties. This demand, then, is only another indication of the strength of competition; and expenditures for higher education can in many cases be classed among those items which have social recognition for their object.

Summary. An analysis of mass expenditures is, on the whole, disappointing. Any idealistic supposition that human beings are longing to develop their intellectual faculties as fast and as far as resources will permit cannot be supported by the character of expenditures. Only a small minority of the population pay much attention to the cultivation of the higher faculties; and even among them efforts are generally half-hearted, except in a still smaller minority composed of the leaders of the various cultural activities. This does not mean that people as a whole are lazy and inactive. Actually they expend an enormous amount of energy, but it is consumed in the production rather than in the consumption of wealth. Indeed, production is so exhausting that resources devoted to consumption are used for relaxation and comfort, rather than for further effort. Of the desires selected for gratification the purely physical pleasures come first, and any surplus remaining tends to be used primarily in keen competition for social position and social esteem.

The Utilization of Commodities. The foregoing discussion has had to do with the nature of human desires and with our ability to satisfy them through the purchase of commodities. It still remains to consider the actual use we make of the goods selected. Whether for good or for ill, the purchases will now be assumed, and our next task will be to estimate the actual amount of utility obtained.

In this final phase of consumption, the utilization of goods, there appears to exist a vast amount of waste quite comparable to the losses arising from ignorant and careless buying. As a preliminary to this discussion, certain economic terms should be defined. First, consumption of wealth refers to its use in the satisfaction of wants. Consumption is, then, quite different from destruction of wealth, which means that in some way wealth is made unfit for use; and both may be contrasted with the waste of wealth, which means that goods are allowed to lie idle without serving any useful purpose. Waste may, indeed, imply a gradual deterioration of the commodity, but it does not mean a sudden and irrevocable destruction of it.

Much wealth is destroyed. With the above distinctions in mind it will at once be evident that a vast amount of wealth, produced at great effort, is never consumed at all in the proper sense of the term but is destroyed or allowed to go to waste; and that society is to that extent impoverished. The most obvious loss is the destruction of wealth from fire, or water, or from the action of other forces of nature. The loss from fire alone in the United States is estimated to be about $500,000,000 per year. Many of the losses due to the elements are preventable, though it cannot be maintained that all are. Nevertheless it is notorious that as a nation we are very careless and take great chances on the loss of property as well as on the loss of life. Our carelessness in permitting the destruction of wealth is now beginning to be realized, and has aroused considerable discussion. Definite measures are already being taken to preserve such national resources as forests, for example.

Curiously enough, when the problem concerns finished products, the solution aimed at does not seem to depend so much

upon greater care in the prevention of loss as it does upon extension of the system of insurance against loss. Insurance, of course, merely serves to divide the loss among a larger number of persons, so that the individual loser is partially compensated; but it in no way diminishes the loss itself from the point of view of society as a whole. Yet many persons still cling to the idea that, if the individual receives compensation from the resources of a large insurance company, no actual loss has occurred. Such a fallacy is the result of a point of view that is extremely individualistic, instead of social. Indeed, the system of insurance develops best in a country which has a strong sense of individual rights and individual freedom, while methods of prevention keep pace with the growth of social responsibility.

Another source of loss, reaching astonishing proportions, is the destruction of food and raw materials by insects and animal pests. Losses from insect pests are estimated to be not less than ten per cent. of the total crop; and rodent pests destroy approximately $500,000,000 worth of raw materials annually. Finished products in the hands of the consumer are subject to destruction or injury from negligence or carelessness. These various sources of losses are cited merely as illustrations of the vast destruction of wealth; and they reveal the careless attitude, and perhaps the gambling instinct, of the population, since many of them could be guarded against by methods that are obvious, though sometimes costly. There are also, of course, agents of destruction which are still beyond our control, such as earthquakes and tornadoes.

Much wealth is wasted. The waste of wealth through disuse, and also through misuse when it fails to satisfy the need to which it is applied, is widespread. Waste in some of its phases is closely connected with ignorant buying. When a purchaser chooses commodities which fail to fulfil his expectations; or when, through the enticements of clever advertising, he makes a selection which gives him poor or only partial satisfaction of his wants, then consumption is wasteful.

Besides the wastes in unwise purchasing traceable to the activity of sellers, another type of foolish expenditure is traceable to imperfect estimates of our own needs. The purchaser

continually selects commodities to satisfy ephemeral desires which, even if real enough at the time, subside long before the articles themselves are consumed. But it is not always the need itself which changes. We all of us now and then purchase commodities intended to satisfy a permanent need and afterwards grow weary of them, discard them and purchase others, hoping these will prove more interesting and satisfying. Sometimes such extravagances are the result of changing moods, but more frequently they are due to the desire to acquire higher standards of comfort or to conform to new styles. Frequently goods are stored away to make room for new styles which have caught our fancy. Social losses from unwise buying could be reduced if exchange markets were instituted for goods which failed to satisfy the original purchaser; or if, in some way, partially used goods, instead of going to waste, could be put into the possession of those who could make them still serve a need.

If we could actually find out the truth, undoubtedly we should discover that a considerable portion of all purchases were either wholly regretted by the purchaser, or had proved to be extravagant means of satisfying fleeting or insignificant desires. Part of the waste in purchasing comes also from overbuying by those accustomed to satisfy every whim with little thought of cost; a waste that may well be contrasted with the persistent conservation of goods by the poorer classes long after they have passed their pristine usefulness. Cases of economies such as these do not, however, counterbalance the extravagances of the rich, because needs are not well served by goods which are outworn or spoiled.

Conclusion. Our examination of the character of the consumption of wealth leads us to the conclusion that it is an imperfect and little developed part of our economic system. The studied efficiencies and the painstaking economies of competitive production are in a sense counterbalanced or wasted by extravagance and carelessness in the consumption of the finished product. To plan and to labor for the attainment of physical well-being through increased production by superior methods is unquestionably desirable. But society would gain even more from a wiser use of the goods produced. Consumers

stand greatly in need of practical instruction in the art of purchase; and they need also to learn how to estimate more intelligently what their real needs are, while the majority would profit also by training in the proper utilization of the commodities they do purchase. General well-being could be enhanced enormously by the cultivation of this much neglected factor in the consumption of wealth.

Our conclusion with regard to the economic system as a whole is that the different divisions are in very different stages of development. Production is, on the whole, well organized and efficient, though it does not yet take sufficient account of the human element as compared to the material factors. The system of the distribution of wealth, on the other hand, is still so imperfect as to indicate that its whole organization has been somehow perverted from its true purpose, which is to supply goods which shall satisfy wants. The trouble is partly traceable to lack of proportion in the various factors of production, and partly to the fact that distribution has been made subordinate to the production of wealth and continues to be regarded as the end and aim of the economic system. Distribution is constantly being used as a means of stimulating production, instead of production being used as a means for the more important object of satisfying wants. And the economic system as a whole, including both production and the auxiliary process of distribution, fails to work smoothly and continuously, not because of fluctuations in wants, but because of lack of organization and of proper coördination of means to ends. Lastly, the end for which the whole organization exists, that is, the consumption of wealth, is wasteful, not because of deficiencies in the economic structure, but because of the ignorance and incapacity of the consumers themselves.

The defects in the economic organization are serious enough merely from the point of view of the immediate well-being of the individuals themselves; but we shall see in later chapters how far reaching is their influence upon the character and efficiency of the other social institutions, and therefore upon the general welfare of the whole social body.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. If you live near an industrial center, find out if the factories run throughout the year. If not, why do they close down? What happens to the employees when the factories are closed?
2. If a Secretary of Industry were appointed as a cabinet officer, do you think he could effect any great improvement in the economic organization?
3. With no directing head to our economic organization, what does determine the amount of commodities which shall be produced? Are the amounts produced reasonably well adjusted to the demands?
4. Are farmers in your state losing money on their crops? If so, what do you think should be done about it?
5. Can you think of any forms of disagreeable work now performed by human labor which might be done by machinery? Why do we not use machinery to a greater extent?
6. Are you able to estimate the quality of the goods you buy, or do you rely upon the statement of the salesman?
7. What are the various motives which influence a consumer when he (a) buys an automobile, (b) builds a house, (c) purchases tickets to the opera, (d) selects a college for his son?
8. What were the fire losses in your city during the past year?
9. Ascertain the estimated annual losses on agricultural products before they reach the consumer.
10. Summarize the improvements which you think are most needed in the economic organization as a whole.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

FOLSOM, JOSEPH K., *Culture and Social Progress,* Chapters 9 and 14.

HETHERINGTON, H. J. C., and MUIRHEAD, J. H., *Social Purpose,* Chapter 9.

HOBSON, J. A., *Work and Wealth,* Chapters 9 and 10.

CHAPTER VI

THE FAMILY

The Family the Foundation of Society. The family is that small group from which springs the life of each individual member of society. It may be likened to the cell of an organism in that it provides the life energy for the group. It should be considered as an indivisible cell for, although it is made up of individuals, these individuals are not complete in themselves. They function properly only as they are related to the family group. In infancy the individual is dependent upon the family both for his physical nurture and for his social training; and later in life adults, in newly established family groups, continue to satisfy their physical needs and to receive much of their social and moral discipline within this circle. Both child and adult, therefore, normally obtain from the family their best care and training.

Individuals inevitably derive social training from the family, because in it the relationships are very close and personal, and because the family is much like a miniature of society itself. In as much as the normal family comprises members of both sexes and individuals of different ages, the various influences which sex and age have to offer are all present; and the intimate contacts which occur within the family prepare the individual to encounter later the broader and more varied associations of life in society.

The Character of the Family Association. The form of the family as an association presents several peculiarities, and these are responsible both for the strength and the weakness of the family group. The family is the smallest of all social groups and contains no formal organization. Such order and authority as exist in it are due to the relative ages of the members. The characteristics of small associations, as has been

pointed out in a previous chapter, tend to give prominence to the individual, and the family is no exception to the rule. It reflects accurately the character of its individual members. A family composed of superior members, well adapted to one another, provides an almost ideal center for social training. On the other hand, one composed of inferior or inharmonious members will be incapable of preparing the new generation for the larger social life, and society will suffer accordingly. In as much as all individuals are of course far from perfect, families can never be ideal groups, reflecting as they are bound to do the defects of the individuals composing them. Consequently we should not judge families by too high a standard but should regard them as organizations which are performing their functions more or less creditably. But the average family, notwithstanding its shortcomings, seems to do the work of socialization better than any of the other institutions thus far devised.

Another point to consider is that the family belongs to a primary form of association; that is, its members come into personal contact. This characteristic is of fundamental importance, for it stimulates from the earliest years the social development of personality so important for individuals who are to become active members of a larger social group. It is particularly the association between individuals of different ages, not only between parents and offspring but between children of various ages, which makes the family relationship so stimulating and fits the new generation for the wider circle of society, where its members will come into contact with a greater variety of personalities.

Changes in the Character of the Family Association. While the characteristics of the family group just noted apply in general to all types of families, certain changes have taken place in the family association during recent generations which have had considerable social significance. As the size and density of the population has increased, the family, unlike the other social organizations, has grown smaller instead of larger. Not only has the average number of children decreased steadily during the last century, but the numbers of the rela-

tives and other persons who used to be included in the family circle have fallen off. This decline in the size of the group has brought about social changes which are not yet fully appreciated. In the smaller group the child, since he is influenced by fewer persons, makes fewer adjustments. In the process of becoming adapted to his group, he has less need to modify his personality; that is, as the sociologist puts it, he becomes less completely socialized. Here, then, is an excellent example of the working of that general principle that the smaller the group the more individualistic are its members. The individual remains more self-centered simply because he has less need to consider others, and the sharp edges of his egotism are not smoothed down.

On the average, therefore, members of small family groups go out into the world less fully socialized than do those trained in larger groups. Now, if the smaller family of today is doing its work of social adaptation less adequately, more is necessarily left for society to do; and as yet society has not realized the extra demand upon its educational resources. Self-centered individualism will become a painfully manifest trait in modern societies unless other institutions succeed in supplementing the imperfect work of the modern small family.

Another change which has taken place in the character of the family is its manifest trend towards greater democracy among its members. This may be due partly to the smaller size, which permits each personality to stand out more prominently; but it is also traceable to wider changes going on in society as a whole. Women, for various reasons, have won wider political and economic independence, so that they no longer hold a subordinate place in society but have achieved a position of practical equality with men. This general improvement in the social status of women could not fail to be reflected in family life. In the smaller group women are no longer relegated to a position of inferiority or servitude. The old patriarchal idea of the family in which the male head was supreme has gradually given way to a partnership between two equals. Furthermore, this principle of democracy is not confined to the relations between husband and wife, but is

being extended to the children as well. While of course there can never exist absolute equality between persons of very different ages and different stages of mental development, nevertheless the old patriarchal relationship of authority and subordination has passed away. Children are given greater freedom both in expression and in action, they suffer less restraint and repression, and they practise less self-sacrifice and self-control. In fact they are no longer insignificant members of the family circle. They advise, if they do not dictate, in family affairs. This trend towards democratic relationships serves to augment the tendency, always to be found in the small group, to exalt the individual; and it renders still less complete the process of socialization within it.

The Decline in the Functions of the Family. The functions of the family have undergone marked changes from time to time, as the character of social life has altered. In a primitive form of social organization many activities normally center in the family group; but in a more complex social organization specialized agencies arise, which take over some of these activities. In this respect, again, the family may be likened to a member of an animal organism. Animals among the lower species have fewer organs, and the work of these organs is less differentiated; while among the higher species the organs are more numerous and specialized, each tending to perform a single function. This decrease in the number of social duties performed by the family might from analogy, then, be considered a normal trend indicating a late stage of development.

Back in the Middle Ages, for instance, the manor, which was an enlarged family group, was almost wholly self-sustaining. Social life, simple in form, was practically complete within it. As societies have grown and broadened, the tasks of the church and of the state have become more and more differentiated; and these institutions have taken over some of the duties formerly carried on by the family. But for a long time the family retained many of the economic activities, provided informal education and moral training, and was the center for a modest amount of social life and recreation.

In modern times specialized institutions have become so numerous that they have absorbed many of the old home activities. All formal education has come within the province of the schools; churches and church schools are now relied upon for religious training; and economic production is normally carried on in factories and special shops. Some of the simple processes, like sewing, are still sometimes carried on in the home; but these may be regarded as survivals of primitive methods of production. Nowadays the ordinary situation is for children to leave their homes for school, and for productive laborers to leave their homes for work. The home has lost, too, much of its old prestige as a center for social life and recreation. Indeed, social activities are likely to be on too large a scale for the ordinary home; therefore they have to be transferred to buildings and halls specially provided for social purposes. So there have been formed special clubs for different ages and for the two sexes, which cater to the respective demands of their members. Both the kinds of recreations and the numbers participating in them have so changed that the home is no longer a practicable center for amusement. Commercialized recreational centers, attracting crowds, are used instead. The normal condition now is for the members of a family to leave home for their recreation also; and, since their tastes differ, they are not likely to go out as a group, but each, in the company of his own special friends, seeks the particular form he prefers.

Changes in the Physical Characteristics of the Home. The picture of the family given here would seem to indicate that as a group its ties were becoming continually weaker, and that its members were held together less and less by common interests. This tendency is furthered by the transformation going on in the physical setting of the modern family. Until quite recently the typical home, even for the middle class, was a sizable house surrounded by grounds. Now both the houses and the grounds have shrunk in size, though in smaller towns they are still to be seen; and in the larger cities separate houses are disappearing and are being replaced by apartments, or by suites in a family hotel. The reasons for

this transformation are too numerous to discuss in detail, but among the more important may be noted that the large house is no longer really necessary: first, because the families themselves are smaller; and, secondly, because of the development of those specialized institutions which are displacing the home as a social center. Furthermore, coincident with the smaller demand for it, the commodious dwelling has become too expensive for the average family income. This is not merely because of increase in rents and land values, which tend to rise with the growth of cities, but also because the scarcity of servants makes its upkeep both difficult and expensive. Finally, the changed conditions of social life have themselves made it distasteful for women to spend so large a part of their time as they formerly did in the performance of household drudgery.

Although this change in the physical conditions of home life has accompanied the change in social life, it is not entirely the effect of the latter. Each has influenced the other. The extensive building of apartments for small families has tended to put a premium on small families. It is becoming increasingly difficult for families with children to find suitable accommodations. This shrinkage in the size of living quarters has also tended to suppress more rapidly the old family activities. The inconvenience of providing meals in a small apartment, on the one hand, and the extensive growth of public dining rooms, restaurants, and lunch counters, on the other, have combined to push the family outside the home even for eating—that function which has always seemed such a natural and indispensable part of home life. With the family hearth transformed into a radiator, and the family dining room reduced to a breakfast nook, the old family life has lost much of its charm and sociability. The old mansion with the enclosed grounds stood for life within the home; the modern small bungalow with the large automobile in front indicates life outside the home. Such an alteration in the character of the family, that cell-unit of society, cannot be of trivial concern. Necessarily it will produce far-reaching effects on the life of society as a whole.

The Problem of Divorce. This gradual disintegration of family life is presented here as the most significant change which is taking place in the group. Yet to many thoughtful persons, the only change worthy of serious consideration is the increasing ease of dissolution of family ties in the form of separation or divorce. Divorce, however, should not be looked upon as a single isolated problem of the family, but rather as an extreme manifestation of a larger problem of the general weakening of the family relations. It must not be supposed that divorce means fewer successful marriages than formerly. Unhappy marriages have always been common; but under modern conditions divorce is tolerated, and the failures are made public, whereas formerly the poorly mated were usually forced to continue their life in common.

In as much as two-thirds of the divorces now granted are on the initiative of women, causes for divorce would seem to be connected with the changed social status of women. In the first place, the lessening of the cares and duties of the household have left wives more time to concentrate on the defects in their marriage relations; whereas in large families disappointments were less strongly felt because attention was diverted from them by heavy responsibilities, and emotional compensation was found in the children. Naturally divorce is more likely to be contemplated in families with few or no children. Wives with leisure to think and to dream, with the movies always at hand to fill their minds with glamorous pictures of romance so different from the humdrum of ordinary married life, naturally become discontented and long for more satisfying emotional experiences.

This increasing realization of the shortcomings of marriage, however, is only one factor in increasing divorce. Woman's economic independence, and her enlarged interests and activities outside the home, offer her new possibilities for a fairly satisfactory independent life. Perhaps it is not an ideal life nor a complete life, but it may still seem preferable to a cheerless family existence. Economic independence, then, which provides women with a safe refuge from repressive marriage

bonds, is the second factor in the modern phenomenon of divorce.

The third and final cause is the changed attitude of society towards marriage, which is of course a social institution and requires for its dissolution a social sanction. Society has varied in its attitude towards the marriage union in proportion to the stress it has laid upon the immediate happiness and welfare of the individual as compared with the ultimate welfare of society as a whole. The family, as has already been shown, is a basic institution; and it is for the interests of society that marriages should be enduring. But, as every institution exists ultimately for the welfare of the individual, in actual practice a balance has to be sought between the interests of the individual and those of society; or, perhaps it would be better to say, between the immediate and ultimate interests of individuals. Although society has not always recognized the just claims of the individual, at the present time it tends unquestionably to sympathize with his demands for as full and complete a life as possible; and it deprecates the sacrifice of the individual for any indefinite or uncertain future advantage to society. This present attitude of society, when applied to the problems of the family, means that it sympathizes with those who find marriage a failure, and is willing, therefore, to grant divorces on grounds of incompatibility.

This attitude on the part of society itself completes the process which has facilitated divorce. Its three phases have come about simultaneously through the rise of forces closely interrelated. Just as the economic activities of the family were giving leisure for a realization of the defects of marriage, increasing opportunities outside the home made divorce financially and economically possible, and, at the same time, social recognition of individual rights facilitated formal sanction to the dissolution of marriage ties.

Although divorce may be looked upon as one phase of a more comprehensive problem of family organization, it does of course present a problem all its own; and that is, whether dissolution should or should not be allowed at all. And, if it should sometimes be permitted, under what conditions could

it be granted and still preserve the best interests of all concerned? Any detailed discussion of these questions belongs to that department of sociology dealing with specific social problems.

The Essential Functions of the Family. Since the importance of the family as a social unit has been declining so rapidly, it may well be asked if this process is to continue until the family ceases to be a permanent social institution at all. Such an outcome would be quite impossible. There has been confusion of thought as to the true nature of the family as a social institution, due to the fact that it has often performed duties which do not necessarily belong to it, and which might quite as well be undertaken by other organizations. Indeed, the family is such a fundamental institution and so adaptable to varying needs that it habitually assumes all the social duties which other institutions fail to perform. There are, however, a few functions which are all its own and which can never be delegated to other associations. These are: first, the proper mating of the sexes; second, reproduction; third, the care of offspring at least during the early years of life; and fourth, the establishment of a normal center of social life for its members. These may be regarded as the irreducible minimum of family functions, though there are other duties it usually undertakes to make more efficient its performance of these. Of these functions the only variables are the third and fourth. What is the exact amount of training which the child should receive in the home rather than in other social institutions? And to just what degree should the home serve as a center of social life for the various members of the family group?

The Problem of Sexual Mating. The existence of two sexes with complementary characteristics means that the individual is not complete in himself but needs to be supplemented by another individual of the opposite sex. Complete or ideal life is to be found only in the union of the two sexes which forms the basis of the family. Successful sexual mating is the bringing together in marriage of two individuals with characteristics which shall harmonize. The importance of sexual mating is therefore much greater, both for indi-

vidual happiness and for social welfare, than we ordinarily realize. Indeed, the essential condition to a successful and enduring family life is wise choice of mates. Disintegration of the family is traceable to uncongenial mating more frequently than to any other cause. Yet we make little effort to remedy the situation. We fret and fume about the disruption of family ties, while at the same time we permit the choice of mates to depend upon chance acquaintance, passing impulse, or mere material considerations, and make no positive attempt to control this choice by reason or foresight. Instead, we try to reform the family by holding uncongenial couples together by force in the fatuous belief that, if actual dissolution is avoided, the family concerned may yet prove to be a success. We should realize that, had the parties been suited to each other originally, the union would have continued without outside compulsion. Only a union based upon congeniality can be a really successful one.

Sexual mating is the most important function of social life which is still left without social control. However, a remarkable advance has been made in our attitude towards sex in the last generation. Under the pressure of the modern conditions of freedom, sex has finally become an openly accepted fact; but we shall have to progress much further than mere acceptance and learn consciously to use and direct this force to wise social ends.

As for the present disintegration of the family, the objection may be made that it cannot be due to poor sexual mating, since it is a modern phenomenon, while the problems of sexual mating must always have existed; and there is no reason to suppose that mating is now done less well than formerly. In answer it may be pointed out, however, that, with the achievement of the equality of the sexes, the problem of sexual mating has assumed a new aspect and has become much more complicated than it was formerly. Indeed, it may even be asserted that it has become an entirely new problem; but we have been so slow in realizing this that we have made little attempt to deal with the new difficulties. Sexual mating, on the new democratic basis, calls for the satisfaction of both

parties in a marriage union; whereas, under the old system in which the female was subordinated to the male, his satisfaction was sufficient to ensure permanence of the union. The female was supposed to accept conditions as she found them, and if she were displeased she had to make the best of an unhappy situation. Now the time has come when adaptation must be mutual, and the happiness of both parties has to be taken into account. This state of democracy in the marriage relation complicates matters and makes the likelihood of failure much greater.

The difficulties of mutual adaptation. Successful mating is difficult of achievement, because so many points should be taken into account when choice is made. On the one hand, the personal qualities of the prospective mates must be conducive to harmony; and, on the other hand, environmental conditions outside the individual, such as wealth, social position and family connections, all have their place in producing harmonious relationships. In some countries these are the chief considerations determining choice; but in our own country they are usually made secondary, the chief emphasis being laid upon personal qualities. Important as environmental conditions may be, to make them the determining factors, ignoring the attraction due to personal qualities, would cause a perversion of sexual mating. Individuals would then be mated with things instead of with other individuals. Even when personal qualities are made the basis of choice, however, serious errors are likely to occur because these qualities themselves are so difficult to estimate. In as much as marriages which ignore personal qualities are not ordinarily successful, we shall disregard marriages for social or economic advantage and consider only those which are based upon personal attraction.

The personal qualities important in mating include two sets of characteristics: those due to sex, and those due to moral and intellectual traits. For example, everyone possesses in greater or less degree what we call sexual attractiveness from the point of view of the other sex. In addition everyone possesses a particular set of personal traits, exhibited in in-

tellectual interests and social qualities, which determine his mode of life. Now the sexual attractiveness which forms the basis of romantic love should without doubt be given due weight in the choice of mates; but, after all, in the long run persons live together primarily as individuals, and so a similarity of tastes and mental qualities is essential for a harmonious life in common. Congeniality in both these respects is requisite to ensure a happy married life; but the combination is the more difficult to find because the first is based upon an emotional reaction while the second is an intellectual estimate.

Sexual attractiveness varies greatly in quality and tone with different individuals. Furthermore, a person attractive to one may not be nearly so attractive to another. The strength of an emotional appeal then can only be estimated by the one under its sway. Others can never judge it, nor is there any known way of measuring it. On the other hand, personal qualities can be estimated by others. Indeed they may often be more clearly discerned by others than by those involved. It is said that love is blind, which means of course that persons under the stress of sexual emotion are not likely to exercise their reason and make a critical judgment of personal qualities. So it might often be well if the choice of mates were not left entirely to the emotional reactions of those concerned. Assistance in the choice of mates from families or friends would by no means be an unreasonable procedure. Even though others could not determine the power of the sexual attraction, they might still be helpful in estimating personal qualities. Often members of the same sex have a more intimate knowledge of one another than members of the opposite sex can easily obtain.

The social attitude towards marriage and the choosing of mates varies widely among different nationalities. In Latin countries marriage is generally held to be a family affair, and the choice of mates is left for the most part to the parents. In Anglo-Saxon countries marriage is considered to be primarily an individual affair, and the choice is left to those involved. From the analysis given above of the factors which determine a successful union, it would appear that the safest

method of choice would lie somewhere between the two extremes. While the individuals themselves should be free to make the final decision, yet other people, especially members of the respective families, might be depended upon for advice much more than they usually are in Anglo-Saxon countries.

At any rate, the only conclusion possible is that those proposing to enter into the marriage relation should come to know each other well beforehand. Hasty marriages and "run-away" marriages are the most likely to be unsuccessful and most frequently lead to divorce. The knowledge of mental traits requisite for successful mating depends both upon an understanding of the characteristics of the opposite sex in general, and also upon intimate acquaintance with particular members of that sex. Neither is to be obtained by casual association with a few persons. Rather they require wide acquaintance and long continued intercourse. For this reason informal comradeship of the sexes from early years is helpful; it puts them at greater ease with each other and gives them a chance to realize and estimate the differences which exist between them. Because of this knowledge they are prepared to make wiser choices than are those whose acquaintances have been limited.

The need for high ideals. Another reason for failure in marriage is the low ideals which young people so often have both of the opposite sex and of the marriage relationship itself. If they form high ideals of the opposite sex, they will be satisfied only with persons who fulfil those ideals. And if each sex demands high qualities in the other, this will act as a powerful lever towards raising people up to those standards. High ideals mean that superior personal qualities as well as sex attractiveness will be demanded in mates, while low ideals mean that sexual appeal alone will be the determining factor in choice. Now sexual attraction, important though it may be, is not a very dependable basis for permanent family life. Dependence on high ideals, demanding superior personal qualities, will bring about more satisfactory unions, and will at the same time furnish a constant stimulus for individual development in order that the demands of the opposite sex may be

met. For approval of the opposite sex is one of the strongest incentives to activity and achievement in social life.

While it is easy enough to recommend the adoption of high ideals as a requisite for successful sexual mating, it is a much more difficult matter to create them, because ideals are not independent products of the individual mind but are absorbed from society in some subtle manner almost beyond our comprehension. Chance words, suggestions, representations on the stage and in books, all contribute to impress us with what society thinks and feels. Improvement in the ideals of young people, then, would require the reformation of society as a whole, and would be no simple thing to accomplish. Nevertheless, although the range of social forces is wide, among them certain strong avenues of influence are capable of control. Since ideals are so largely formed through the medium of artistic representations in their various appeals to the emotions, reading matter and theatrical productions of all kinds should be carefully regulated. It is much better, for instance, for young people to read romantic novels than the so-called modern realism. While for certain purposes it may be excusable to portray life on its baser side, for the formation of ideals it is much better to picture it in its nobler aspects.

The need for a more serious attitude towards marriage. Not only does each sex need to have higher ideals of the opposite sex, but the general esteem in which marriage itself is held should be raised. Nowadays marriage is regarded rather too generally as an individual affair and too little as a social obligation. Inevitably, then, if its aim is the promotion of personal pleasure and personal convenience, when marriage ceases to contribute to individual comfort, it is looked upon as something to be discarded. Under the influence of such laxity, marriage is not infrequently entered into carelessly, or even flippantly, with the assurance that if the partnership is not successful it may be dissolved and another trial made. One of the most serious consequences of easy divorce is that it tends to make prevalent the impression that marriage after all is only a temporary relationship, depending for its continuance upon the pleasure of those concerned.

Marriages, unfortunately, are continually being contracted because of passing impulses, when no strong sentiments are involved. Society coöperates by permitting the contract to be as simple and secret as may be desired. It has always been easier to enter the marriage relation than to withdraw from it; but now, with the exits increasing, it is easy both to enter and to withdraw. It would perhaps be better for society if it should make the entrance not difficult, but more formal and impressive. The separation of the church and the state, and the insistence by the modern state that marriage is merely a civil contract to be performed by civil magistrates, have removed much of the impressiveness surrounding the marriage ceremony. After all, formalities and ceremonies do create an impression of seriousness in an event; and such formalities as the announcement of engagements, the publishing of the banns of marriage some time before the wedding takes place, and an impressive marriage ceremony, all tend to regulate and dignify a relationship which has great social significance. In addition to such externalities, however, the individual himself needs to be educated to regard marriage much more seriously than the average person does now.

The need for a wide circle of acquaintance. The suggestions given above are some of the more important methods of improving sexual selection; but there are other measures which, though of a minor character perhaps, might easily be included among the measures for improvement. We have seen that ideal sexual mating ordinarily depends upon intimate acquaintance and upon a realization of the seriousness of the marriage contract; and it is of course obvious that the interests of society demand the largest possible number of desirable marriages. Surely, then, it would be advantageous, and not at all indelicate, for social organizations to become active agents in promoting acquaintanceship among young people with the definite end in view of securing more and better marriages. Naturally such assistance would be superfluous in many instances where normal social relationships were already sufficiently extensive and varied. But, more often than we realize, especially in large cities, opportunities for normal

social intercourse are very scant; and many people have scarcely any chance to become acquainted with members of the other sex of the same social rank. These conditions are abnormal, and they could be easily remedied with the expenditure of a little care and effort. Reform here would contribute both to the promotion of healthy social life and to the ultimate establishment of more and better family groups.

In taking measures to promote marriage, however, our idea should not be that everybody ought to marry. Some people are unfit, either physically or mentally, to enter into the marriage relationship. Though it may be desirable for society to promote the maximum number of congenial unions among the healthy normal members of the population, it is equally important for it to take an active hand in preventing marriages among the unfit. As conditions are now many inferiors do marry, while many normal persons remain unmarried for various preventable reasons, unfortunate as this may be for the best interests of society.

Summary. It is evident that sexual mating is an extremely important concern for society in general and for the institution of marriage in particular, because it is the preliminary and fundamental step in the family relationship. Upon it depend the success and permanence of the family itself. Yet, notwithstanding its importance, it is left largely to chance; and this plan of ignoring the issue has not been justified by the results. The requirements for the successful mating of the sexes, and the difficulties in the way of attaining it under the new democracy prevailing in family relations, are not generally recognized; and consequently little conscious effort is being made for improvement. Yet its realization should be the chief endeavor in any organized movement for the reform of the family. We have been mistakenly concentrating our attention upon divorce, which is merely an evidence or symptom of ill health, and have been trying to apply our remedies there, instead of endeavoring to reform the family at its root and thus assure a healthy growth.

The Problem of Child Training. The second function of the family, reproduction, is part of the large and compli-

cated problem of population, which will be discussed in a chapter by itself. We will, therefore, next proceed to a discussion of the family as a center for the nurture and training of children. While the first function of the family, the proper mating of the sexes, concerns for the most part the happiness and development of the partners in the union, the third function concerns primarily the next generation. This does not mean that the presence of children has no effect upon the happiness and development of the parents; but society regards any such effect as merely a minor by-product of the family relationship.

Society concerns itself with the family chiefly because of the influence it exercises upon the character and welfare of the rising generation. Children are looked upon as the raw material which must be moulded and disciplined to fit into a very complex social life. The process of adaptation to it, at least in its early stages, depends upon family influence. If the family does its work well, society receives a useful, perhaps a superior, citizen; if it is inadequate to its task, individuals are thrust upon society who not only do not contribute their due share to its welfare but may even become a burden to it in care and expense. It is no wonder then that society is keenly interested in the quality of family life.

The influence of heredity. Parents are responsible for their offspring in two ways: first, in the physical and mental qualities which they transmit by inheritance; and, second, in the influence which they exert over them after birth. The physical inheritance of the child is of the utmost importance because it furnishes the raw material for development. The child is bound to inherit the characteristics of its parents, or at least of its immediate ancestors transmitted through its parents. If, therefore, individuals possess such inferior qualities that their children are likely to be subnormal, they should not be permitted to marry; and the problem is a preliminary one of sexual mating. But in cases of average or superior parents, the probability is that the children will receive at least average physical and mental traits, though exact characteristics cannot be predicted, because we cannot foretell which qualities or

what combinations of qualities they will inherit from their respective parents. Certain physical characters, it is true, may be predicted fairly accurately, but not the more important mental qualities. Consequently it will be sufficient to remember that, in heredity, like tends to produce like, and to base our calculations on this very general rule.

The physical care of the child. In our present discussion of the problem of child training, we may assume that there exist certain undeveloped traits or possibilities in the infant, derived from its parents, and consider how these will be influenced by the family group. The characteristics requiring development are of two kinds, physical and mental. Good physical development of the child is important, not merely because of its inherent desirability, but also because it conditions the mental and social life of the adult. It is now believed that good physical care in early years is of much greater importance than is apparent at the time. It guarantees not only a healthy childhood but a more vigorous manhood.

A few examples will serve to emphasize the importance of physical care and the unfortunate results likely to follow any neglect of physical needs. Insufficient food during early years may stunt both the physical and mental growth of the child. The wrong kind of food, or poorly cooked food, may not only impoverish the whole system but may permanently impair the digestive organs. Lack of fresh air and sunshine may permit early infection from tuberculosis or allow other diseases to take root. Neglect of teeth or tonsils, both common foci of infection, may not only seriously affect physical health but also retard mental development. Indeed, several types of apparent subnormality in children have been traced to a physical cause. In later life, physical weaknesses and poor resistance to disease obviously keep adults from doing a normal amount of work, seriously impair their earning power, and may even result in their economic dependence. Finally, physical deficiencies or abnormalities are likely to produce inferiority complexes, which inevitably distort a person's attitude towards others and so harm his social life.

The serious consequences of physical neglect are now so

well recognized that society is beginning to provide facilities for safeguarding the physical welfare of children by means of agencies outside the home. Although this assistance may be desirable and even necessary under present conditions, it bears witness again to the relative incompetence of the family group.

It is of course obvious that the attention given to the physical care of children differs greatly in different families. The more intelligent parents with adequate means do provide reasonably effective physical training; and, it may be added, this training tends to become more and more rational as time goes on. But families of the poorer classes are generally so ignorant of proper physical care that it is not surprising to learn that the infant mortality, even in the United States where the conditions are comparatively favorable, is six times as large as the mortality of the total population. In certain industrial centers the mortality of infants of working mothers is five times as large as the average infant mortality.

While intelligence and common sense can provide reasonably effective treatment for children, these qualities alone cannot ensure the best care. So it is fortunate that we are gradually accumulating a scientific body of knowledge concerning the proper care of infants and children. This includes knowledge of such subjects as the amounts and kinds of food needed, the quality of clothing that is best, and the amount of exercise and sleep desirable. Instruction is being given in schools of home economics, but as yet it has reached only a comparatively small part of the population; and the information will be slow in spreading to the masses unless it is disseminated to a greater extent in the lower grades of the schools. Greater effort could profitably be made by philanthropic societies also to spread this information among the more ignorant classes.

The social and intellectual training of the child. When we come to a consideration of the family as a center for the social training of the child, we are confronted by an even more difficult subject, but one which is more closely connected with the subject matter of sociology. The family is bound to furnish

the initial mental and social training for the child, even though it may share this work at an early period with other institutions. The infant, endowed with various inherited tendencies, which at first are not much more than possibilities, must almost from the start undergo the discipline necessary for socialization; that is, he must learn to adapt himself to the complex requirements of social life. The child must also acquire those external forms of adaptation to others shown in the observance of recognized conventions and customary modes of action. He must be trained in the general traditions of society. Finally, he must learn to be considerate of others, or, in other words, he must acquire moral discipline.

Such attainments as these are essential to the socialization of the child; and he acquires them with more or less effectiveness within the family circle. It may be that members of the family do not consciously train the child in all these ways; but, as he must inevitably be made to adapt himself to the comfort of the others, the training does go on. And this training which adapts the child to the family adapts it also to society, because the family is a miniature society. Generally, therefore, the child becomes socialized in proportion as its family is a well-rounded and normal reflection of society itself; and he retains primitive and anti-social traits in so far as the family life is defective and the moulding process remains incomplete.

The family can never be of course a complete replica of society, because it is so small. Indeed, it would lose its essential value if it were large, for children have to become acquainted with and adapt themselves to other individuals gradually. Only as they grow older may their circle of acquaintance profitably be enlarged. The normal method of training, therefore, would keep the child when very young entirely within the small family group, and only very slowly enlarge his experience through casual acquaintance with such other people as may temporarily enter the family circle where the setting is familiar. To let him go outside the family too soon into a new environment to meet new individuals would be unprofitable. It would only fatigue the child and make

him self-conscious. As he matures he can meet, though still gradually, a larger and larger circle of acquaintances and come into contact with new situations; so he may to advantage be sent out from the family for short intervals to obtain the benefits of new contacts, though only to return again shortly to the familiar surroundings. As his development progresses these intervals may be longer and the contacts sought may be more varied; until finally the formal family connection is broken, and he starts a new home of his own. In this way the family shares with outside agencies the development of the child as it grows older, keeping to itself the entire training during the most impressionable years.

The early training of the child, upon which must depend his comprehension of his duty to others and to society as a whole, is a difficult and delicate process, necessitating for its success a personal and intimate relationship with those who possess sympathetic insight. It requires unlimited attention and patience on the part of parents, and it is assisted by association with brothers and sisters. For the purposes of socialization the complete family is one with two parents and more than one child. The loss of either parent, or the lack of brothers and sisters among the children, results in an imperfect family, since it does not include all the influences of age and sex to be found in the outside world.

Especially important to the process of child development is a sympathetic insight into the child's character on the part of the parents, and a responsiveness to parental care on the part of the child, only to be earned by intimate association and wise treatment. It is natural for the child to give his confidence to persons whom he trusts, but he may easily be checked by rebuffs or unsympathetic responses. Free and unabashed expression, so essential for the development of the child and also for guidance of the parents, needs to be continually encouraged if a confidential relationship is to continue. Such a relationship is not something to be constructed by rule, nor is it to be summoned at pleasure; it can only be the outcome of intimate association. Therefore the ideal family is one which makes the home its true social center,

encouraging social contact among its members. The small, incomplete family which reduces its functions to a minimum may still exist and even perform a useful service; but it is not nearly so effective in the training of children as the larger family which can maintain, within its own limits, a reasonable amount of social life.

The benefits of social life within the home. The purpose of social life within the family circle is first of all to promote acquaintance. However much parents may think otherwise, few of them actually know their children in the sense of really understanding their personalities. Such understanding does not result inevitably from the mere formal intercourse between parent and child but depends rather upon the ability of the parent to draw conclusions from chance expressions and unconscious actions when the child is off his guard. Cultivation of common family interests gives the parent the best means of gaining this knowledge and so of attaining that sympathetic insight into its character which will enable him to direct and control the child intelligently. Without this knowledge his influence is bound to be limited and he is liable to make mistakes which may cost him the child's confidence and respect.

Not only are intimate family relations advantageous to parents, they are also essential to the normal development of the child. His personality develops on the one hand with the growth of his knowledge of other personalities, acquired in the family circle; and, on the other hand, through self-expression within that circle. Self expression is of particular importance to development. It may easily, of course, be carried to an extreme, and it needs to be guided and restrained in the interests of others; but it should not be repressed, otherwise mental development may be stunted. Unless the child has companions, either among children or adults, and preferably among both, his normal powers of expression will be inhibited; and in adult life he will be unable to share his ideas with others, that is, he will not become a normal social being.

While family life within the home is chiefly valuable in promoting intimacy among the members of the family, through it also are controlled other associations of the child, and his

activities. The benefit is obvious, for, if children cannot get recreation and social life at home, they will naturally go elsewhere for them and may become subjected to temptation from lack of oversight. Of course with our modern tendency to institutionalize recreation, it is no longer possible to find all forms within the home. Nevertheless, the home may still be kept as the chief social center.

The efficient home, then, from the point of view of the development of the children is one which carries on more than the minimum of family activities. And the ideal family is not one that merely nurtures the child during the period of infancy and then afterwards relaxes its efforts and even disintegrates; it is rather the family that retains its solidarity as a unit and carries on all the various activities essential to normal social life. It does not surrender its functions to other institutions, nor does it relinquish its responsibilities as the children begin to go out into the world. It does, indeed, cooperate with other institutions while continuing to do its own part; but it uses other agencies merely as instruments for the promotion of broader activities and as a means of supplementing the inevitable restrictions of home life.

It must be concluded, then, that the best interests of society demand that the present tendency towards the disintegration of the family be checked. It is possible, as is frequently claimed, that this phenomenon of family disintegration may prove to be one of those temporary phases which inevitably accompany any readjustment of one social institution to new social conditions. True it certainly is that a significant alteration is going on in it, as the family assumes a more democratic character coincident with the enlarged freedom and broader activities of women. These new conditions may eventually evolve a type of family superior to any we have previously known; but, in the process of reconstruction, society should take care that the family does not give up any of those various functions which are essential to its highest efficiency. It is doubtful if outside agencies can ever perform so effectively as can the family itself the duties of the socialization of children.

Family Life Essential for the Welfare of Adults. The function of the family in creating a home atmosphere for adults, as well as for children, need not be discussed at any length after what has already been implied. It is evident enough that everybody needs some kind of a home. Although one or another may get along with bachelor quarters, and even realize in them a pleasurable independence, the great majority of human beings find in the family circle their most congenial environment. Socially, family life is the normal life; and the mutual care and service which the members render one another are not to be found elsewhere. It is not unnatural, therefore, that men and women weary of lonely, isolated existences should sometimes seek permanent congenial associations in marriage for the sole purpose of enjoying a home. Although the establishment of homes for adults is not the primary purpose of marriage, it is neither unreasonable nor is it undesirable that marriages should be contracted with this particular end in view. Family life, to be complete, must include all the four purposes previously enumerated; but marriages contracted for any one or more of these purposes may be perfectly legitimate and desirable.

Conclusion. Before finishing this discussion of the family, another point of special importance should be noted, and that is the intimate relationship existing between the welfare of the family and economic conditions. So far we have confined our consideration to the tendency of the family to disintegrate and to the question of its efficiency in the performance of its essential functions. Considering now these two tendencies in their relation to economic status, we find that inefficiency is most marked among families of the poorer classes, and disintegration has gone farthest among families of the wealthy classes. These attributes of the respective classes, through frequently attributed to economic status, are more directly traceable to characteristics which accompany poverty and wealth, such as ignorance on the one hand and self-indulgence on the other. It is among the families in moderate circumstances that efficiency and unity are most likely to be

combined. In a previous chapter it was pointed out that moderate wealth, sufficient to offer opportunities for wholesome living but not sufficient to obviate the need to labor, was socially the most desirable. It now appears that the most desirable economic status is the one most advantageous from the point of view of family welfare. Reforms in the direction of a more equal distribution of wealth would not only be advantageous to individuals but would do more than any other one thing to improve the character of the family.

The success of the family, like that of every other institution, is dependent also upon the quality of its members; and the subject of population will be discussed in the following chapter.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Compare families you know having one child, three children, a larger number of children. What are the relative advantages or disadvantages?
2. Compare the social life and activities of a family living in a hotel, or small apartment, with one living in a large house. What are the relative advantages for the children?
3. Report on the number of divorces granted in the United States as compared with other countries.
4. What do you consider the chief causes of family disunion? Are there any remedies?
5. What measures in your opinion would lead to an improvement in the mating of the sexes?
6. What are the more serious deficiencies in the training of children (a) in poor families, (b) in middle-class families?
7. To what extent are these deficiencies made up by the schools or other institutions?
8. Is it better for children to be educated partly in the home, or entirely in the school?
9. Is it better for children to have part of their religious instruction in the home, or all of it in the church?
10. Is it best to have social gatherings for young people in the home, or in the school, or in the church, or in some general social center? Give reasons.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

BEACH, WALTER G., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapter 20.
BOWEN, EZRA, *Social Economy,* Chapter 17.
DOW, GROVE S., *Society and Its Problems,* Chapter 11.
ELDRIDGE, S., and CLARK, C. DEW., *Major Problems of Democracy,* Chapter 1.
ELLWOOD, C. A., *Sociology and Modern Social Problems,* Chapters 4 and 8.
GOOD, ALVIN, *Sociology and Education,* Chapters 4 and 6.
GROVES, ERNEST R., *Social Problems and Education,* Chapters 5 and 6.
ROSS, E. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 49.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROBLEMS OF POPULATION

The second function of the family, reproduction, influences directly not only the welfare of the family but also that of society as a whole. From the point of view of the family, size affects materially its efficiency as a social unit. From the point of view of society, the size of the population determines both the character of its activities and its prosperity.

The problems of population are of two general kinds: those of size, or more accurately rate of growth; and those of quality.

Recent Trends in Birth and Death Rates. Before discussing the problems of the growth of population, it will be necessary to have in mind modern trends in both the birth and death rates, for it is of course evident that the natural rate of increase of a population is the difference between the birth rate and the death rate.

TABLE 1

BIRTH AND DEATH RATES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

	1876		*1901*		*1913*		*1926*	
	Birth	*Death*	*Birth*	*Death*	*Birth*	*Death*	*Birth*	*Death*
England and Wales	36.3	20.9	28.5	16.9	23.1	13.8	17.8	11.6
Scotland	35.6	20.9	29.5	17.9	25.5	15.5	20.9	13.
France	26.2	22.6	22.	20.1	19.	17.7	18.8	17.5
Germany	40.9	26.3	35.7	20.7	27.5	15.	20.7	11.9
Italy	39.2	28.8	32.6	22.	31.7	18.7	27.8	16.8
Netherlands ...	37.1	23.5	32.3	17.2	28.3	12.4	23.8	9.8
Norway	31.8	18.	29.6	14.9	25.2	13.2	19.7	10.6
Sweden	30.8	19.6	27.	16.1	23.1	13.6	16.9	11.8
Switzerland ...	33.	24.3	29.	18.	23.1	14.3	18.2	11.7

Table No. 1 shows the wide variation of birth and death rates in certain selected countries. It also shows the decline

which has taken place in both birth and death rates during the last few decades, particularly in industrial countries. It will be observed that there may be an approximate equality in the actual rate of growth of different peoples which have wide variations in birth and death rates. For example, Italy with high birth and death rates has an increase appreciably less than that of the Netherlands which has much lower rates. There are two ways in which a people, or an animal species, may survive and adapt itself to its environment. One is through a high rate of reproduction with little care for the young, so that the species persists through chance survival of some of the offspring. The other way is through a low birth rate accompanied with a high degree of parental care, so that most of the offspring normally survive. In the case of animal species, a low rate of reproduction and prolonged parental care are characteristics of the higher forms; and in the human species the same principle applies to peoples in different stages of development. A high birth rate with an excessive number of deaths is an extremely wasteful method of adaptation. Children are born and reared only to die before they become productive laborers. A reduction in the death rate, at least to that point where all those survive who are normal, physically and mentally, is universally regarded as a social gain.

The reduction in the birth rate, which usually accompanies or closely follows a decline in the death rate, is not so universally approved. Many people contend that for the welfare of society the birth rate should be maintained at its maximum. Still others maintain that any decline in the birth rate should not be greater than the decline in the death rate, that is, that the increase in population should not be checked. And a third group holds that a decline in the birth rate to the extent of a gradual decrease in the rate of growth of the total population is a normal phenomenon as populations become denser.

To arrive at some reasonable conclusion concerning these various points of view is the purpose of this chapter. The desirability of a rapid rate of increase of the population will be considered both from the point of view of the welfare of the family and of that of society as a whole.

As a preliminary to this discussion, it should be pointed out that a high birth rate accompanied by a low death rate would result in a very high rate of increase for the total population. And, while such a rate of increase might be advantageous in a new country with rich natural resources, its continuance in a settled country where the natural resources were well exploited might seriously threaten the standard of living. The problem as it presents itself to many families, and even to whole classes in the population, is that of a choice between large families and the maintenance of a high standard of living; and the choice usually made is that of the standard of living. But the social desirability of this choice is not so certain because the term "standard of living" is used in different senses. If it is used to mean a well-ordered life with educational and cultural advantages and careful training for the children, it is a wholly desirable objective, even though it necessitates a limitation in the size of the family; for quality in human beings, as well as in material goods, is more desirable than quantity. If, however, a high standard of living means merely the enjoyment of luxuries and the selfish pursuit of pleasure, it may become an objective detrimental in the long run both to the individual and to society itself.

Although the problems of the size of the individual family and the rate of growth of total populations are not simple, some light may be thrown on them by an analysis of the social conditions to be found in different stages of economic progress and the advantages or disadvantages which are likely to accompany a rapid growth of population.

The Ideal Size of the Family Group. It is best to begin the discussion of this problem with its simplest form, that is, the size not of the total population but merely of the family group. So much has been said concerning the size desirable for the family that the question would seem to be a difficult one to determine. The difficulty has been magnified, however, by the fact that those interested have invariably taken the point of view of society as a whole, instead of that of the family itself. By introducing such questions as race suicide, or the advantages of large populations, or the difficulties of

finding adequate food supplies, they have complicated the discussion and clouded the issue. If we should confine ourselves to the family group, temporarily leaving out of account its large social aspects, we could easily arrive at a few simple and useful conclusions.

It was pointed out in the previous chapter that one of the most important functions of the family was to act as a training school for the socialization of the child, and that, from this point of view, the family with several children was a more complete social unit than the family with only one. The child, for its normal development, needs association with other children as well as with adults. Two children in a family, therefore, offer a source of development of which an only child is deprived. And probably three or four children form a much more effective circle than two, not merely because of the larger number, but because the larger number is likely to include both sexes; and there is a real advantage in having each child associate with other children of both sexes. Families of three or four children, therefore, may be considered efficient social units.

From the point of view of social training, families larger still would not be objectionable; indeed, they might be desirable, though the efficiency of the family as a training school by no means increases in proportion to the size of the group. The gains arising out of the wider association are soon offset by diminished parental care and attention. Association among the children does become more intense, but care of younger children by the older soon has to take the place of attention from the parents, and it can never be so advantageous. Any slight advantage due to more contacts may easily be compensated for later by association outside the family. There is, therefore, a natural upper as well as lower limit to the desirable size for the family. The upper limit is the point at which intimate parental oversight declines and has to be replaced by child care. And the lower limit is that at which adult attention is likely to be too minute and continuous, and association with other children is lacking. All these considerations, however, are too indefinite to make the exact size of the

ideal family an invariable number, especially as the possibilities for development differ with different economic conditions.

In considering the upper size limits of the family, a second factor besides social efficiency soon enters, and that is the quality of the family group. The effective care and training of children is a drain, not merely upon the time and strength of the mother, but also upon the financial resources of the family. While the cost of education varies with different stations in life, few families except the very rich can educate many children without considerable sacrifice. With the majority of families the question of the number of children desirable is not merely a problem of maternal care, but also of paternal support. It involves giving the children a start in life at least equal to that their parents had, without entailing so much financial sacrifice that the family will be in danger of lowering its standard of living and therefore its efficiency.

The reasonable conclusion with regard to ideal size is that families should be governed: first, by the standard of the effectiveness of the group as a social unit; and, secondly, by their financial ability to give the children adequate care; that is, families should have no more children than they can afford to train to their accustomed standards of living, provided those standards are reasonable and desirable.

The Actual Size Does Not Conform to the Ideal. Such seemingly reasonable requirements might cause us to assume that families with the smallest earning power would be likely to have the fewest children; and that in other families the size would vary, roughly at least, according to resources. But the facts given in the table below indicate an actual condition which is the reverse of our expectation. It appears that, on the average, the poorest families have the largest number of children, and that in general the numbers decline instead of increase with greater wealth. Clearly, then, other considerations than those mentioned above are actually present to affect the size of family groups. Parents in some of these groups seem to be singularly uninfluenced by the highest welfare of their children, and sometimes even by their own selfish interest.

In as much as families are established for several purposes,

it is to be expected that different individuals and different classes in society should be swayed to some extent by different motives. The fact is, a great variety of motives enter to determine size of individual families, and so, indirectly, the rate of increase of populations; but uniformity in the decline of the birth rate as economic status rises suggests that the average families in groups given in Table 2 are after all actuated by some common motive. This motive is not the highest welfare of the children, but is rather the desire to conform to a particular standard of living.

TABLE 2

BIRTHS PER THOUSAND WOMEN, 15-50 YEARS, ACCORDING TO ECONOMIC STATUS

	Paris	*Berlin*	*Vienna*	*London*
Very poor districts.....	108	157	200	147
Poor districts.....	95	129	164	140
Comfortable districts....	72	114	155	107
Very comfortable districts	65	96	153	107
Rich districts.....	53	63	107	87
Very rich districts.....	34	47	71	63

Reasons for Differences in Size of Families. Although the table presented above divides the population roughly according to income, it conforms indirectly also to degree of education. Other factors which accompany economic status may be as influential in determining size of families as income alone. The more intelligent classes exercise greater foresight and consider more carefully the welfare of their children, as well as their own immediate comfort, than do ignorant classes. Therefore they restrict the size of their families to the number they can support without endangering their standards of living. The difference in birth rates between the rich and those in moderate circumstances is probably not traceable to economic status so much as to social condition and mode of life. The rich have a varied and exacting social life, inconsistent with the responsibilities entailed by the rearing of large families. The size of their families, therefore, is regulated not so much by the actual expense of providing for children,

as by their desire for convenience and comfort. Most families desire some children to carry on the family line.

The poor have the largest instead of the smallest families of any class in society, because they have the least foresight and self-control. They propagate without regard to their ability to care for offspring, with a resulting high death rate, especially among infants. Nor are they influenced by social standards of living, as are the members of the middle class, since already they form the lowest stratum in society. The presence of a large number of children does not alter their mode of life, nor does it affect their standing among their associates.

It must be admitted, furthermore, that the economic drain is much less with them than it is with the middle class. In as much as they belong for the most part to the unskilled classes, their children do not require an expensive education; moreover they become self-supporting at an early age. Even before they are fully self-supporting, they usually receive money for casual jobs, which proves an acceptable addition to the family income. The children of the poorer classes, therefore, although they are a drain during the years of inevitable dependence, soon become a family asset; and so they are not regarded as entirely a burden, even from the economic point of view.

The standards of living of the poorest classes are so low that, if they never had any ambition to improve them, they could, from their point of view, just as well have as large if not larger families than the classes above them. It is only when they do perceive the desirability of raising these standards that it ever seems advantageous to them to restrict their numbers. Actually, however, some restriction would be wise in the interests of their children even with their present low standards, since, lacking the requisite care, children often fail to survive. Fewer children would mean a greater proportion of survivors; and this would be a gain both to children and to parents. A low birth rate with a resulting low death rate is ordinarily a sign of social progress.

Summary. The foregoing analysis of the increase of population shows that, from the point of view of family welfare, the

actual size of the family groups in different classes does not correspond very closely to ideal requirements. The families of the wealthier classes, and perhaps those also of the middle classes, might well be larger; for, although their numbers are regulated by standards of living, which is a rational system, these standards themselves are not altogether desirable, since they lay too much stress on individual comfort and too little on family welfare. A readjustment in ideals would in the end be of advantage to the individual as well as to the family group.

On the other hand, the poorest classes have families that are too large, because they are so little influenced by standards of comfort and well-being. Reform in their case is not easily achieved, though the most hopeful course to pursue would doubtless be education in higher standards. A gradual improvement in education and character building, a wider acquaintance with the comforts and conveniences of life, would gradually instil a desire for better living conditions and at the same time would prepare the way for their achievement. Efforts must naturally be directed towards the younger generation, for they would have little effect upon the adult population. By concerted action directed towards elevating standards of living, however, perceptible improvement might be hoped for within the period of a single generation. In fact, our schools by themselves are achieving notable results along this line, and their work is now being supplemented more and more by other agencies. Improved standards are, to be sure, also dependent upon higher wages; but these are already a possibility, as was pointed out in a previous chapter. Direct instruction as to better modes of life and the more efficient consumption of wealth should accompany increase in the means of consumption, otherwise the larger income is likely to prove of little permanent advantage, or even to be wasted.

The Attitude of Society Towards the Growth of Population. After the discussion of population from the point of view of family welfare, we have next to consider it from the point of view of the welfare of society; and in the last resort this is the more important problem of the two. If the wel-

fare of the individual family group does not always coincide with the best interests of society as a whole, family considerations may have to be sacrificed to the larger good. The question is whether the social needs of the population differ from, or are inconsistent with, the interests of the family.

It is customary to regard increase in population as a healthy sign. In a new country like our own we advertise the rapid growth of our town or our city with triumph; and we regard the increase of the total population of the country as a sign of prosperity. Not only do we favor a rapid natural increase in the population, but, in the past at least, we have thought it to our advantage to hasten its growth by attracting people of other countries to settle here.

In older countries, however, with more settled economic conditions, an increase in population is regarded in a somewhat different light. Finding room for increased numbers becomes a problem; and an outlet is usually sought in emigration. If, therefore, some countries are seeking to attract large numbers, while others are trying to get rid of their surplus, the situation would seem to show that there was a maximum desirable for each country beyond which it was not profitable to go. The problem, then, is to ascertain what are the actual benefits to be derived from increase in population, and to determine at what point large numbers cease to be advantageous.

Requirements for War Purposes. Before proceeding to a discussion of the ultimate economic and social value of a large population, it will be well to note that unlimited increase for competitive reasons has many advocates. Countries wish to grow at least as rapidly as their neighbors, lest they fall behind in the competitive race and become overwhelmed if war breaks out. The competition in populations is similar to that in armaments, for men as well as guns are needed to conduct a successful war.

To this type of argument the sociologist has nothing to say, for general well-being is no longer the aim. The problem has become one for the politician to solve. If nations existed for the purpose of destroying one another, and if human beings were trained up only to be massacred, then the growth of pop-

ulation could follow no rational law. Under those circumstances it would doubtless be best for every nation to multiply as rapidly as possible. Any rational law of the growth of populations must be based on normal internal conditions, and it could not take account of unforeseen calamities.

A New Country Profits by an Increase. From the point of view of internal welfare, the desirability of a growing population in a new country is fairly evident. With plenty of land and undeveloped natural resources, new settlers in no way interfere with the prosperity of the older inhabitants, but contribute rather to the welfare of the country both economically and socially.

Economic results. Economically the newcomers contribute their full share to the production of wealth, just so long as new land or other undeveloped resources are available. In fact they may contribute more than a proportionate share, because gains are to be derived from extended coöperation in production, and, as population grows, wealth per capita increases for a considerable period. Every increase in wealth is advantageous, not only because it furnishes more consumable goods, but also because it provides a surplus out of which savings may be made. All capital savings in a new country are very precious, since they can contribute effectively to still further increases in wealth through the adoption of new and better methods of production.

The advantage of mere increase in amount of wealth is, however, not so important as the improved conditions of life resulting from greater variety of production. As population increases in any country which yields more than enough to satisfy the bare necessities of life, there will be more workers to carry on more occupations and produce a greater variety of commodities, so that human welfare will be enriched through the availability of more and more of the comforts of life. In a new country, therefore, an increasing population is economically desirable, since it adds both to the quantity and to the variety of the goods available.

Social results. The social advantages of a denser population in a new country are less easily comprehended. A denser

population brings about increased association and also stimulates the growth of specialized organizations which contribute to social efficiency. As settlements grow and vacant places are filled, the isolation and loneliness of the frontier disappears, social contacts are more numerous, and social life becomes more intense. This enlarged association not only assures greater pleasure to the members of a community, but introduces an element of real progress. Individual development and social progress do not take place in isolation, nor even in very small groups. From the social point of view, therefore, a denser population is desirable, both because the individual needs variety in contacts for his normal development, and because a social organization requires large numbers for the growth and prosperity of its institutions.

Social and Family Interests Coincide in a New Community. The desire for growth which is uniformly present in a new society has a sound basis, and therefore the interests of individual families do seem to coincide with the welfare of the community as a whole in sparsely settled regions. The frontier usually attracts a vigorous population. Opportunities for labor there are unlimited and easily perceived, and the cost of rearing children is at a minimum because no specialized training is required. They begin to contribute something to the family income at an early age, and their education and training are obtained largely in connection with their work. Under these circumstances families are uniformly large, at the same time that society profits most by increase in numbers. As far as the population is concerned, the interests of society and those of the family are here identical.

An Old Country Profits Little from an Increase. *Economic results.* In a more advanced stage of society the gains from a growing population are somewhat less evident, though they are still of the same general nature. In a country which has already attained a fair degree of density, with numerous large cities, further increase in numbers serves to intensify competition. Occupations become diversified until all essential commodities are produced. Then the best interests of the individual lie in specialization. He has to make a

place for himself in a field already overcrowded; and he can achieve this only by surpassing his fellow worker, either by a more rapid rate of production, or by performing a superior type of work. Consequently he has to devote himself to a narrow field and become an expert in a particular line. And these same conditions which make specialization desirable on the productive side, make it possible also on the side of consumption, because the denser population affords a larger market for the product.

In an advanced stage of society, then, an increase in population is not easily nor quickly absorbed. New workers find opportunities only in specialization and, with increase in density, specialization becomes more and more minute. Usually, no doubt, the total amount of wealth is increased and general well-being is enhanced by the further division of labor, so long as the other essential factors of production are available. But eventually the economic advantages of increased numbers and more extended division of labor tend to become offset by a serious basic deficiency; for that essential factor in production, land and rich natural resources, cannot increase indefinitely as population grows. The result of this limitation is that wealth per capita—or more accurately the amount of natural products such as food and raw materials—will begin to diminish. Therefore the interests of society require that in a well-developed economic organization, increase in population should go on more slowly than in a new country, in order that any surplus of workers may be absorbed in specialization without endangering individual incomes and lowering the standards of living.

The tendency for per capita wealth to decrease if increase in population is too rapid may be offset, however, by one or two counteracting forces, which have actually operated to a considerable extent in the United States. In the first place, although we cannot create nature, we have been discovering and bringing into use natural resources in different parts of the earth's surface hitherto unavailable. This addition to our natural resources has not, however, kept pace with the growth of population; and we may look forward to a time when the

earth's surface will have been fully explored and her resources so fully developed that no further relief may be obtained from this source.

Another and more potent influence to counteract this tendency towards a relative decrease in production comes from our continued improvements in methods. Our advance in scientific knowledge, and our application of this knowledge to practical ends, has enabled us to extract more from the land already under cultivation. New scientific discoveries are then the means which must be relied upon in the future to make the products of nature keep pace with increase in population. Improvements will continue to be made, but their nature and their utility cannot be predicted. Whereas in new and undeveloped countries increases in population may be provided for by the exploitation of new natural resources, in advanced countries increases will have to depend upon improvements in methods of production.

Social advantages. The social advantages of an increase in population in advanced societies are similar to those under more primitive conditions, though it is true that the benefits accruing become less evident as density increases. As has already been pointed out, a dense population increases individual contacts and permits the development of social institutions. Of course these results are highly desirable, but in a large population the time soon arrives when contacts become superficial and less stimulating. Finally the stage is reached where the social advantages of a denser population are more than offset by the physical difficulties of caring for larger numbers.

Much the same thing may be said of the development of social institutions. A population of only moderate size develops most of the institutions and organizations essential to its well-being. When it becomes much larger, these same institutions are merely multiplied in order to care for the increased numbers. Any new associations which come into existence in very large populations are usually for the purpose of dealing with the unhealthy conditions resulting from the density itself. It is true that certain kinds of institutions,

such as those having artistic, scientific, or educational ends in view, do become more comprehensive and efficient in large centers of population. These cannot be multiplied indefinitely for each city, partly because talent itself is limited, and partly because the number of consumers must be large to make such organizations worth while. As means of communication improve it is to be expected that a larger and larger part of the population will be able to profit by these scattered institutions, either by going to them, or by having their products circulated through smaller centers. For a long time we have been accustomed to having musical and dramatic companies sent out on tour, and this practice is on the increase. Now art exhibits are also being widely circulated, exhibits from agricultural colleges tour their states, and, through university extension, lecturers from the great universities are sent to small communities to extend the advantages of the higher education.

Since the exceptional and expensive social organizations develop only in large centers of population, there is some inherent advantage in having populations grow; but the gain comes to be less and less significant after the density has reached a certain point. For ordinary social purposes and for the establishment of essential institutions, a population soon reaches a size of high efficiency beyond which further gains can only come slowly. The advantages themselves, too, run the risk of being offset by serious evils, especially if the growth of population is so rapid that effective physical provision cannot be made for it. In contemplating all the various physical and social effects of the rapid growth of our large cities, one cannot help remembering with admiration the wisdom of Aristotle, when he stated so long ago that a city of about one hundred thousand people was large enough for the best interests of the inhabitants.

Summary. We may conclude, then, that in advanced societies an increasing population is generally advantageous; but that the gains due to larger numbers are less marked as population becomes dense, and society is better served when the increase takes place slowly.

Economically a large population tends to force more minute forms of division of labor; and, while this is ultimately advantageous, time is needed both for the efficient development of new occupations and for the specialized training of the workers. Furthermore, the time comes when improvements have to be invented in methods of production, or new natural resources have to be discovered, in order to keep the supply of raw materials on a par with the needs of the larger population; otherwise per capita production will tend to fall and so endanger the standard of living. Therefore economic readjustments are easier when the increase is not a rapid one.

Socially, too, gains from continued growth, after a certain point, are likely to be small. Any advantage to be derived from the more numerous but more superficial contacts may be more than counterbalanced by the physical difficulty of caring for larger numbers, unless the growth takes place at a very moderate rate. The advantages to be gained from the establishment of new types of institutions can only gradually make themselves felt; and the necessary multiplication of ordinary institutions, merely to care for the larger numbers, has to take place slowly in the interests of effective organization. From both the economic and the social points of view, then, it appears that, after a population has reached a considerable size, further growth should take place at a much slower rate.

Social and Family Interests Coincide in Advanced Communities. If we compare now the interests of society as a whole with the interests of individual families, in so far as they are affected by growth of population, we shall find that these interests coincide again in the more advanced stages of social development as they did in the more primitive types of society. It has just been pointed out that society can absorb but slowly the highly specialized kinds of workers; and it is equally true that families can produce them but slowly. In a type of economic organization characterized by a high degree of specialization, children no longer contribute to the family incomes; on the contrary they are a continual drain on the family resources until maturity, because of the long period

of education necessary to fit them for their places in the economic system. While it is natural, therefore, that families of the middle class should find themselves unable to rear many children, that they should not do so coincides with the interests of society.

The conditions prevailing among the lowest class are somewhat different, however. There, labor is still cheap; and competition among cheap instruments of production tends to their utilization in ineffective and uneconomical ways. Their occupations do not require special preparation but only the training to be derived from practice. Therefore the cost of rearing children is small. Moreover, industrial societies are usually able to absorb unskilled laborers rapidly, though as capital becomes plentiful and cheap it tends to displace this grade of labor; and as this process continues the need for large numbers of unskilled laborers declines. From the point of view of improvement in standards of living, therefore, it would be better for the poorest families to have fewer children.

Would a Stationary Population Be Desirable? The above analysis has shown that in a new society with a plentiful supply of natural resources, a rapid increase in population is advantageous; but that as natural resources are developed and competition becomes more intense, a slower rate of increase is more desirable. The question then arises as to whether the time may not come when increase in numbers will be arrested and a stationary population be the normal condition. There is a popular assumption that an increasing population is a sign of vigor and health in society, and that a stationary or declining population indicates the decay or degeneracy of a civilization. It is quite true, to be sure, that a decline in the growth of a population may be caused by racial decay; but this is not necessarily the case. Growth depends partly upon environmental conditions, and these may check increase in a wholly normal manner. If opportunities for the production of wealth become so restricted for any reason that a prevailing standard of living is threatened, increase in population will be checked automatically. It is a recognized law of the growth of population that, when economic conditions make

necessary a choice between accustomed standards of living and large families, the more intelligent part of the population will choose to retain their standards of living and will restrict the size of their families. Now the parts of the earth's surface containing usable land and other natural resources being limited, it is conceivable that, as they become fully utilized, the difficulty of obtaining added food and raw materials might keep people from increasing even though society were still in a healthy condition.

Although such a situation would be possible, it could not be regarded as desirable, for it must be remembered that another possible means of increasing production, aside from the discovery of new sources of supply, is always to be found in new methods of production. Though production may easily reach a limit under any stage of development of the arts, new inventions and new applications of scientific knowledge may increase productive capacity in unforeseen ways, and so permit further increase in numbers. A stationary population, therefore, while it might not result from racial decadence, might still be indicative of unprogressiveness in scientific achievement and in productive methods.

If inventions and improved processes promise to be of so much importance in the future, it would be profitable to discover the conditions under which they are likely to appear and to estimate what may be expected of them; but no exact prediction can be made. A significant fact bearing on this problem, however, is that in the past all notable improvements in methods of obtaining food have risen out of the stress of necessity; and this necessity has usually been larger numbers of mouths to feed. In other words, the very pressure arising from the growth of populations has itself been the stimulus for the solution of the problem of obtaining more food.

Historical Aspects of the Problem of Population. The problem of adjustment between population and food supply, so much discussed in modern times, is not a new one. Crises of maladjustment have probably occurred many times in the

history of the world. It is only the modern attempt at scientific analysis of cause and effect which is new.

Pressure of population has caused the human race to pass through several well-defined stages in methods of food production. In early times primitive tribes consumed the products of nature as they chanced to find them, without any attempt at cultivation at all. This chance method yielded little, and consequently the inhabited areas supported only sparse populations. The known world was very limited, and population was always pressing on resources. At first men solved their difficulties in a very casual manner by killing off their dependents, that is, the infants and the aged, as it suited their needs. But eventually the time arrived when the need for food caused certain groups to hit upon the plan of cultivating a food supply artificially through the domestication of animals. This permitted increase in numbers and, moreover, it enlarged the known world, because then groups could migrate longer distances and take their food with them. In other parts of the world a similar need for more food and for more regular sources of food supply gradually developed the method of cultivating vegetable food by settled agriculture. In more recent times pressure of population has served to bring about the establishment of manufacturing industries and the extension of commerce, as improved methods of solving the problem of the food supply.

History teaches us, then, that the problem arising out of the pressure of population on food supply is an old rather than a new one, and that in the past pressure of numbers on resources has been even more serious than at present. But the extra needs due to overpopulation have always eventually so stimulated invention as to provide a temporary solution, though often only after causing much misery and loss of life. The ever-present expectation that each new solution might prove permanent has always turned out to be a delusion, for population has increased again to absorb new sources of wealth, and the pressure has reappeared on a new level, so that fresh means of livelihood have had to be sought. Yet this ever-recurring struggle caused by increasing numbers has always

stimulated progress and produced new types of civilization.

The Problem of the Future. These lessons from past experience ought to throw some light on the present situation and that of the immediate future. Must a stationary population necessarily be an unprogressive or a reactionary one? Is the continual pressure of population an indispensable stimulus to invention and improvement in the arts? Even admitting that it has been the incentive in the past, must we conclude that it always will be under all circumstances? These questions involve difficult complications, and perhaps no satisfactory answers can be found. There are many examples of individuals, and even groups, who, when the stimulus of necessity is removed, become inactive and unprogressive, contenting themselves with the satisfaction of their physical wants and making no effort for improvement. On the other hand, to offset these cases, there are plenty of examples of persons who undergo great dangers and privations for fame or for social triumph, and others who devote themselves heart and soul to the solution of some minute problem, actuated only by the hope that their effort may add to the sum of human knowledge and so improve conditions for humanity.

Contrasting examples such as these lead to the belief that the stimulus essential to progress varies with the degree of intelligence and the social level of the individuals or the groups concerned. In early stages of social life, physical needs and the continual urge for material possessions were undoubtedly essential to ensure the effort required for progress. But, as intellectual interests increased and social desires developed, labor and thought were likely to be expended for reasons quite other than the need of satisfying hunger. After a certain level of social and intellectual life had been reached, progress went on automatically, stimulated by a variety of motives. So, after all, we may conceive of a society of high social standards which may be stationary in numbers and still progressive in spirit. Nevertheless, we must not forget that in any society the great mass of the population continues to be actuated by more or less primitive motives; so it would be safe to assume that groups whose numbers were increasing

gradually would be much more likely to be progressive than would a stationary population.

It must be remembered that growth of population is first of all a matter of family concern, and that families, in so far as they possess intelligence and foresight, will regulate their size in accordance with the best interests of their members, both parents and offspring. The rising generation assumes importance to society at large only as its members reach the productive age; and this is just the period when to the family they are becoming less of a burden. They are of course consumers from the beginning, but only after the passage of years do they form a part of the labor supply. So, though the family and society do not both feel the effects of increase in numbers at the same time, after all, their interests, as far as the rate of increase is concerned, are not widely divergent. In as much as the family is the unit which feels the burden first, it is the unit that must assume the responsibility of regulating the rate of population growth.

Summary. In summing up our conclusions with regard to the rates of growth of populations, the importance should be stressed of the economic status of the various classes in society, and particularly of their standards of living. In this discussion of the different rates of population growth, the standard of living has perhaps been represented as a stationary factor; but it should not be so regarded. The standard may gradually rise, and when it does the result will be the same as an increase in population or as a restriction upon production; that is, it becomes more difficult to produce enough to satisfy the higher requirements.

Population in a rich and undeveloped environment tends to grow rapidly, for opportunities are ample and the sacrifice involved in rearing children is at a minimum. As the available resources are exploited, the production of raw materials becomes increasingly difficult; and the growth of population will gradually be restricted if there is any danger that the accustomed standards of living will be sacrificed. Or population may be restricted, even before any decrease in per capita wealth occurs, in response to a desire to raise the standards of

living; for elevation of standards requires efforts similar to those needed to support increased numbers on the old levels. Decline in the productivity of natural resources can, to be sure, be offset by the invention of improved processes of production, and these have to be relied upon more and more to furnish the means for the support of increased numbers. While these inventions have been fairly continuous in the more advanced countries, they have not kept pace with the desire for higher standards of comfort; and the rate of increase of the population has had, therefore, to be limited.

Any explanation of the influences at work to affect the growth of population is necessarily rather complicated, because of the presence of three or four factors which are not stationary but ever subject to change. As increase in wealth is needed, it is found first in new natural resources, so long as they are available, and then in inventions; and this increase is used either to support larger populations or to provide higher standards of comfort. Both these ends may, indeed, be achieved at the same time; but, as has already been pointed out, ordinarily the more intelligent classes choose to raise their standards of living, and the less developed classes tend to use their share in the support of increased numbers without changing materially their standards of living. In the United States, in as much as natural resources have not yet been fully developed, and as inventions and improvements have been made rapidly, there has been an unprecedented increase both in raw materials and in manufactured products. This wealth has been sufficient to permit a rapid rise in standards of living and also a fairly steady increase in population, although there is evidence that recently the rate of increase in the population has fallen off. This is especially true in the middle and upper strata of the population, where the rise in standards of comfort has been most rapid.

The Problem of the Quality of the Population. We have next to discuss the second great problem of population, that of its quality. The importance of this phase will be evident to everyone without special argument; but its close relationship to the problem of numbers is not quite so obvious.

In all these discussions it has been assumed that improvement, or progress, in society is desirable; and from time to time means for its attainment have been pointed out. From the point of view of population it has already been shown that peoples who are mentally little developed have required the stimulus of increasing numbers to induce them to labor to produce wealth and improve their condition. But with peoples of higher development this pressure of population is less necessary, as other motives enter to make them industrious and progressive.

To ensure continuous progress, therefore, it is absolutely essential that, as the rate of growth of population declines, and the economic pressure of increasing numbers abates, the level of intelligence should improve in order to introduce other stimuli to progress. In other words, quality in the population comes to supplement quantity and finally tends to replace it as a cause of progress. Improved quality in the population, however, does not necessarily appear automatically at a given stage of density, though more complex conditions do put a premium on superior mental ability. Nevertheless such an important change as that from quantity to quality does not occur without conscious effort and extensive adjustments. So the problem of quality requires serious study, for it is not easy of solution.

Such improvements in the quality of the population as will be helpful in stimulating social progress in large and dense social groups may be achieved in two ways: first, by what is known as improvement in the native quality of individuals, through inheritance of better traits; and, second, by better education, that is, by improved methods of developing the native qualities the individuals possess. The former method is the one usually connected with the problem of population and is the only one which will be discussed in this chapter. The second, though it does have a bearing on the present subject, is really a problem of the environment, and will be discussed in detail in a later chapter.

The Science of Eugenics. The problem of improving the innate qualities of the population is commonly known as the

science of eugenics. Much material has been collected on this subject, but only a brief outline of the suggestions that have been made will be attempted here. Many people have assumed that eugenics requires that the mating of the sexes should be based on a scientific analysis of their qualities with the sole object of producing superior offspring; but such a course of procedure is not seriously considered by eugenists. Indeed, such a method would be entirely impracticable in the present stage of our knowledge; and, considering the larger purposes of marriage, it would be undesirable as well. Individuals possess inherited traits in great variety, some of which become highly developed, while others remain dormant or only slightly developed. We estimate individuals by the developed traits; or, even more inexactly, by their achievements; but the innate traits which remain unapparent are just as likely to be inherited as the obvious ones. It would be quite impossible, therefore, in the present stage of our knowledge, even to ascertain the exact qualities present or absent in any case, much less to estimate the exact effects of all the various combinations of traits possible in the offspring. Of course, in general it is true that when superior individuals of the two sexes mate, the offspring is on the average superior; but what specific traits and tendencies will appear can never be predicted.

The Program of Eugenics. For the improvement of the quality of the population, eugenists advocate as actually feasible two kinds of measures. First, they advocate control of the defective and degenerate members of the population, so that they will no longer reproduce offspring of their own kind. Secondly, they would strive by more indirect means to alter the relative birth rates of individuals and of classes in the population, so that the superiors would produce a larger proportion of the new generation.

The control of defectives. The first part of their program would probably be the easier to achieve, though it is the less important of the two in a program for racial improvement. There is a small percentage of the population, variously estimated from three to ten per cent., which is definitely below

normal either physically or mentally; and they not only fail to contribute to social welfare but they are likely to become a definite burden on the rest of society. These defectives are produced in two ways: first, by disease, accident, or some combination of factors, perhaps inherited but not well understood, that cannot be entirely avoided; and, secondly, by direct inheritance from defective ancestors. It is this inheritance which the eugenists seek to control in the interest of the race.

In favor of exercising control over these classes, eugenists maintain that an individual has no right to marry and reproduce if the larger interests of society are to suffer thereby; that, in all cases where the interests of the individual and those of society seem to conflict, the individual should give way. They propose, therefore, that a more extensive segregation of defective individuals in institutions be made; or, where care in institutions is not feasible, that some method of sterilization be used in order to ensure society against the continued multiplication of defectives.

Laws permitting sterilization have actually been passed in a number of states, but only in one or two states have they been enforced. The excuse usually made is that pathological knowledge is still insufficient to enable us to draw any accurate line of distinction between normals and subnormals; and that this fact would render sterilization laws superfluous because they would apply only to these doubtful cases, since extreme cases would be committed to institutions anyway. While there is some force to this contention, we are using it to excuse our failure to protect society from many cases of the obviously unfit. Even now control could well be more stringent; and, as our knowledge increases, we can deal more safely with the border-line cases. Anyway, public-spirited citizens should interest themselves in all measures intended to reduce the numbers of defectives or subnormals and to improve the average quality of the race.

Increasing the numbers of the superiors. Measures for the control of defectives, although desirable, are after all only negative in their results. They are intended to relieve society of a burden of dependents and incompetents, but they would

not act positively to improve the quality of the normal population. If we are to achieve real social efficiency and make progress continuous, the attainment of a high average quality of individuals through the inheritance of superior traits will be an essential preliminary.

The endeavor to secure a population of higher average quality presents a much more difficult problem; and most of the propositions that have been made for its realization have had to be rejected eventually as impracticable. Production of geniuses, or of individuals of superior talent, is evidently at present beyond our power and has to be left to chance variations. But, in as much as more men of talent come from superior parents than from average parents, the chief hope for positive improvement seems to be in using measures calculated to stimulate the birth rate of superiors and lessen the birth rate of inferiors in the normal population. But all such measures are objected to by one school of scientists on the ground that no marked differences in inherited qualities do exist in the great mass of the population. They maintain that differences in individual achievement, and in the position of so-called classes in society, are traceable rather to environmental conditions and differences in opportunity; and that, therefore, no racial improvement would be achieved by altering the relative birth rates.

While it is undeniable that those differences in level of achievement shown by members of the different social classes, and also those differences shown by the various races and peoples, may be due to variations in opportunity; nevertheless it seems likely that there actually exist also considerable variations in native ability, and that, moreover, these are the ultimate causes of degrees of achievement. Evidence in support of this supposition cannot, however, be reviewed here; and the reader must turn to the more extended treatises on eugenics for detailed arguments for or against it. Here it must suffice to say that, if differences of native ability do exist in the different classes of society, then improvement in the average quality of the race would certainly follow change in the relative rates of reproduction of the several classes. Read-

justment would be brought about more easily through restricting the rates of multiplication of the lower classes than through stimulating an increase in the rates of the higher classes, even though the latter is the positive advantage sought.

The size of families, and the rates of reproduction of the various classes, are influenced, as we have noted, by social conditions. They are not chance phenomena, but follow definite social laws. Little can be achieved, then, from direct appeals either to individuals or to classes. Any change in the rates of multiplication will have to be accomplished indirectly through a reorganization of the particular social factors involved. It has already been pointed out that a rapid rate of increase is traceable either to ample economic opportunities, or, when production is restricted, to a low standard of living; and, conversely, that a low rate of increase is achieved as economic advantages diminish, or as the standards of comfort rise so as to make satisfactory living conditions difficult to obtain.

Applying these principles to the present phase of our problem, it would appear that those classes already enjoying a high standard of living would normally reproduce more rapidly if it were made easier for them to care for and educate their children without sacrifice of standards. And the lower classes in the population would probably restrict their numbers if their standards were raised and they learned to prize the new advantages sufficiently to be willing to maintain them through effort. The measures which might contribute to these ends are many, but the most effective would be to extend training in intelligent consumption of wealth. Although environmental conditions cannot affect directly the innate qualities of the race, they can be utilized indirectly by bringing about a change in the relative rates of reproduction of the different classes. The assurance of a superior population in the future depends upon making the most of the present population.

Conclusion. In reviewing the laws of population, it is clear that the forces immediately affecting the character and size of the population are to be found in the family itself. The quality of the family determines the quality of the offspring.

Its grade of intelligence, its standards of living, together with its economic status, determine the numbers of its offspring and furnish also opportunities for development. Both the numbers and the quality of the population are, therefore, determined directly by the character of the family, and indirectly by the economic conditions which mould the character.

The relationship between the quality of the population and economic conditions is two-sided. On the one hand, inferior economic position is the result of inferior ability and poor quality of the population. But, on the other hand, inferior economic status reacts upon the individual to hamper him, and in the long run it may influence the quality as well as the quantity of the population; so this reverse influence is the more insidious and socially demoralizing. Whether poverty or inferior quality is the original evil can never be determined with certainty; but in either case rational reform lies in improving social status and raising the standards of the lowest classes. These measures would at least tend to limit the numbers of the poorer classes, and might indirectly improve their quality. Of course all direct measures for improving the quality of the population should be utilized as they become practicable; but the easiest approach to reform is through the indirect method of raising standards of living; and this will prove also remarkably effective. In short, the economic problem of distribution and the problem of improving the quality of the population are so closely related that the solution of one will go far to solve the other.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Look up in the last Census Report the population of your city according to sex, marital condition, and age groupings. How do these compare with the state as a whole?
2. How much has the population grown in the last ten years? Describe the effects of this growth upon the city.
3. If your city had double its present population, what would be the gain? Would there be any disadvantages?
4. Would the advantages from the growth of population go on indefinitely?

5. Do you think there is any natural limit to the size of the population of a country?
6. Compare life in a city with life in a rural district. What are the relative advantages of the two?
7. Is rapid growth of population in various countries a cause of war?
8. Is a country in danger from the encroachments of other nations if its population is stationary?
9. What are your standards for estimating quality of population?
10. What improvements in quality do you consider most urgently needed in the population of the United States?
11. Report on the estimate of the number of feebleminded in the United States.
12. Report on the number of the physically defective in the United States.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Bowen, Ezra, *Social Economy*, Chapter 24.
Dow, Grove S., *Society and Its Problems*, Chapter 4.
Eldridge, S., and Clark, C. DeW., *Major Problems of Democracy*, Chapter 3.
Fairchild, Henry P., *Applied Sociology*, Chapter 11.
Hertzler, Joyce O., *Social Progress*, Chapter 17.
Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, Chapter 3.

CHAPTER VIII

THE STATE

Definition. The state is an organization of all the people in a given area for the purposes of self-preservation, the maintenance of order, and the promotion of the general welfare. This form of organization has been so universal that obviously the state should be classified as a fundamental and enduring institution, like the family and the economic organization. The state is the only organization having full authority and not answerable to any other organization; it is the one which, in the last resort, controls all the others and to which both individuals and associations owe allegiance.

The departments of the state are ordinarily divided into legislative, administrative, and judicial. The legislative and administrative powers only of the state will be considered in this chapter. The dispensing of justice through the courts will be reserved for the following chapter.

State Activities Tend to Increase. The functions of the state, like those of the family, have varied greatly from time to time. But, while those of the family have tended to decrease, those of the state have increased with size and density of population. The reason for the decline in the functions of the family, as has already been explained, is because, with the growing density of population, other institutions have specialized and gradually taken over duties performed only indifferently by the family in the more primitive stages of social development. The state has not been affected similarly. As society has grown more complex, the duties to be performed on behalf of the people as a whole have increased in number and variety; so the state has had to enlarge its activities and make them more specialized. The added duties could not be relegated to new and independent organizations, because they

were essentially obligations of the sovereign state, so the complexity of its organization has kept pace with the growth of population.

Functions of the State. A definition of the state in so far as its functions are concerned must be very general. In the definition given above, two functions, self-preservation and the maintenance of order, have been specifically mentioned because apparently they have always been performed by state organizations. There is a group of extreme individualists which maintains that these are the only functions which states should perform. Such limitation, however, has not been the practice of states; and most theorists would defend its assumption of a broader range of activities and include those duties which, though they vary in extent even among modern states, have been grouped under the general heading of acts which tend to promote the general welfare.

Self-preservation the first duty of the state. The first duty of the state is ordinarily understood to be defense from external aggression; and states have always been accustomed to make elaborate preparations for defensive and even for offensive warfare. During those periods when competition among the states was keen, and the interests of the various states were held to be antagonistic to one another, defensive, or even aggressive, warfare was regarded as a necessary if not the only method of self-preservation. But, since improved means of communication have brought about greater interrelation of activities and interdependence of interests, antagonisms have been relatively less frequent and irreconcilable, and the welfare of states has assumed an international aspect. So people are beginning to realize that states can more easily and effectively ensure their own self-preservation by coöperating with other states than by resorting to war.

This attitude of conciliation should be most easily assumed by people accustomed to a federal form of government, like that of the United States, since the original small sovereign states, at the time of their union, gave up any idea of resorting to arms either for the defense of their territory or for the maintenance of their rights, and have since been satisfied to

have their difficulties settled in the courts of the Federal Government. So it is to be hoped that the great sovereign states of the present world may become willing, through world organization, to abandon warfare as a method of settling disputes and may feel that they can safely leave the settlement of all questions of common concern to the decisions of an impartial court. It must be admitted, however, that the world is arriving at this decision, not entirely through the growth of moral sentiments, nor because of the positive advantages of peace, but partly through realization—the fruit of bitter experience—that war has become so destructive and exhausting to nations that even the conquerors may lose more than they gain by it. At any rate, the trend of events in the history of civilization is now unmistakably towards the abandonment of war and the achievement of world unity.

The development of ordered relations between states follows closely the course of the development of justice within the separate states. As the early small state organizations grew stronger, individual or family warfare, as a method of settling injuries, was gradually suppressed in the interests of the larger group; and society undertook to render justice in courts according to recognized law. And later, as states enlarged through the inclusion of smaller units previously independent, these new members were required to abandon individual quarrels in the interests of the larger community. Nowadays, since the great nations have come to be so closely related in economic and intellectual life, and their common interests outweigh individual advantages, they also could profitably give up warfare and settle their disputes in a world court of justice, in the assurance that justice is more likely to be achieved through the deliberations of judges trained in the law than through the vicissitudes of armies in the field. With the growth of this new community of interests, the first duty of the state should be called self-preservation instead of self-defense, because states can now preserve their integrity better through diplomatic alliances than by warfare. While self-preservation is of course a perpetual duty, warfare is only one possible method of achieving it.

Preservation of internal order. The second function of the state, the preservation of internal order, will always remain a necessary and difficult task; but, here also, the method of procedure may vary, as it has in the relationship of states with one another. The preservation of internal order has two objectives: first, the protection of citizens from the depredations of the criminal classes; and, secondly, the settlement of disputes between citizens. In the past, protection has been attempted by the use of severe and cruel measures against offenders, with little permanent success; and settlement of disputes has depended more or less on the exercise of personal power, or even on the corruption of officials, with little recourse to abstract justice. Real progress in the maintenance of order is coming about rather through reforming or eliminating the members of the criminal and anti-social classes, on the one hand; and, on the other, by shutting out contaminating influences in the courts which might hamper the administration of impartial justice among citizens. In as much, however, as the preservation of order belongs to the department of the administration of justice, detailed discussion will be left to the following chapter; and this general statement must suffice for a description of the second function of the state.

Promotion of the general welfare. The third function of the state, the promotion of the general welfare, covers a great variety of undertakings; but only the general principles governing these will be considered, for a detailed discussion of their purposes and their merits belongs to the subject of political science.

The diverse activities of the state may be graded according to their degree of acceptability to the citizens as a whole. There are activities so obviously beneficial to the general public, such as the construction of roads and the coinage of money, that their assumption by the state is not questioned by anyone. Another group of activities dealing with education, health measures, and care of dependents, has been undertaken by the modern state, though many theorists might not consider them as necessary state duties. Under modern conditions, however, the advantage of placing them in the

hands of the state is so evident that few people object to it on principle, though in actual practice there are those who begrudge funds for their adequate support. Still another type of activity sometimes attempted, which is best represented by state interference in economic enterprises, remains definitely on the border-line of acceptable state duties, and by no means receives support from all the people. In general, producers of goods are inclined to resist governmental supervision, while consumers are more favorable to state oversight. Nevertheless, when governmental activity directly assists productive enterprise, as it does in making crop estimates, or in issuing the weather reports, even producers begin to feel that the government does owe them such assistance at least. But when, for instance, the government undertakes, in the interests of the great mass of consumers, to restrain monopoly, to conserve natural resources for the use of the general public, to lower railroad rates, or to protect child workers, then the government is charged with overstepping its powers.

These cases serve to show the wide range of activities possible to the state, and to indicate in what a different spirit they are received by the various classes and individuals concerned. While extension of governmental control often seems to follow chance rather than rule, it is possible to formulate a general principle, as a guide to government action, based on the purpose for which states are formed. If the state is an organization of all the people within a given area to promote the general welfare, then it follows logically that all state action must be directed towards the ultimate welfare of the people as a whole, and never diverted into channels for the private gain of the few if this will be detrimental to the best interests of the majority. The state would obviously be untrue to its trust if it granted special privileges to individuals or to corporations not in keeping with the welfare of the whole; or if it used its power to assist one individual or one party out of many in the same situation. Favoritism in general must be condemned. But this does not mean that, under circumstances of stress, the state cannot assist the minority, or even the very few—as for instance—victims of fire or flood when

such aid is given in the ultimate interests of the group as a whole. The guide to action should always be endeavor to serve public rather than private interest.

The exact type of state activities which are desirable cannot be specifically formulated, nor can their final limitations be foreseen. Necessarily they will vary with different social conditions and with various stages of industrial development. Certainly, though, activities for the protection of citizens against private greed, and those undertakings for the furtherance of the public welfare, must be included among the duties of the state. Furthermore, protection of citizens against the encroachments of others does not mean merely the safe-guarding of their persons from assault, nor their property from theft; it means as well the protection of their health from unsanitary living and working conditions, and of private property from swindlers and extortioners; and it should even include guarantee to individuals of their share in the public property by affording protection from theft and from malappropriation by private interests.

These examples merely serve to illustrate and amplify the definition already given of the sphere of state activities. They indicate, however, the limitations rather than the positive obligations of the state. For a state should not hastily undertake work, however praiseworthy in itself, which its organization does not permit it to carry on efficiently, nor which is beyond its legal powers. Nevertheless, legal limitations to the power of the state should not be allowed to serve as an excuse for governmental inaction. When state interference is plainly needed, and the existing governmental organization is inadequate for the new task, then clearly the first duty of the people is to improve the organization and extend its scope. But any intelligent extension of state power must be based upon a comprehension of the kind of an association a state actually is, and upon an understanding, too, of the way political parties are organized; and therefore this subject will be next considered.

The Character of the State Organization. The state organization, like the economic organization, is often very

large, as, for example, the United States of America; but the state, unlike the economic organization, is compact and highly specialized. It includes all the people settled within its recognized territory; all are subject to the laws of the state; and all must support it and defend it in time of need. On the other hand, every citizen may enjoy the privileges offered by the state; and all are entitled to utilize the institutions established within it.

But this large central structure of the state is not all that is comprised in political life, since, for local purposes, smaller associations are formed on a similar basis. So the complete political unit is really a federation of associations very similar in some ways to the economic organization. The state organization, built up in this way, possesses, we shall find, the characteristics both of large and of small associations. The central state is a typical large association in which structure is prominent, and the individual tends to be absorbed in the group; it is also rather a cumbersome body, not easily altered nor speedily adapted to changing conditions. Its subordination of the individual, and its ponderosity of structure, are especially manifest at times of election, for instance, or of the selection of candidates for office. Also, when new legislation is desirable, the individual seems almost powerless to institute reforms, or even to submit new measures, so hedged about with restrictions is the state and so complex are its processes. He counts merely as one unit in an immense organization which requires, for uninterrupted efficiency, the submissive acquiescence of all its members. In a large state organization, therefore, we cannot expect any quick change in method of procedure, any prompt correction of abuses, nor shall we ever find that ponderous body quickly responsive to a single-handed reformer, even though he be the inspired leader of a local group.

The state organization is supposed, of course, to reflect in general the character of the social group. But, in as much as it changes so slowly, it may often more accurately represent a previous social situation. This is why it always seems such a conservative institution, in constant need of reform, and

the continual target for attack, therefore, from its more radical factions. It seems always to follow rather than to lead in the march of civilization.

The character of the organization of political parties also requires explanation, because control of the state organization comes directly through them; and therefore they possess great influence in the state, even though they do not govern the people directly. Party organizations are also of the large type; but they differ radically from the state organization in being purely voluntary and in having a very loose form of control. Membership is not forced, and the majority take no active interest. These organizations are neither compact nor effectively supervised. For these reasons they are open to grave abuses. It is easy for the members who are really interested to gain control; and the power is liable to fall to those who are actuated by personal and selfish motives rather than by broad considerations of general welfare. The policy of the organization is not dictated by the masses but by party leaders who belong to the type of professional politicians rather than to that of statesmen. Powerful party committees are able to designate candidates for election and outline party platforms. The voter finds that the only privilege left to him is the registering of his choice among the candidates selected for him, even though none may be satisfactory.

For this unfortunate situation the average citizen is usually blamed. It is maintained that, if voters took more interest in party affairs, better candidates, or at least candidates satisfactory to the majority, would be nominated; but this assumption is only partially correct. It would be impossible for everyone to take an equal interest in public affairs. The average citizen in private business, who is not personally nor financially concerned in an election, inevitably pays less attention to political affairs than do those whose living depends upon the election to office of their chosen candidates. The evil in the situation is largely inherent in the character of the party machinery, which naturally is controlled by those most interested. Their chief concern is, on the one hand, to select candidates who will carry out their wishes; and, on the other

hand, so to organize and manipulate the lukewarm voters that they will elect the candidates nominated. But, though these are the purposes of party organizations, it does not follow that the ends sought are always financial or even personally selfish. They are often matters of sectional interest or of general public welfare; and, the higher and broader the character of measures promoted by politicians, the better will be, of course, the character of the state. For an adequate reform of the political situation, more will be needed than wider participation and more active interest of citizens in party affairs.

From this account it should not be assumed that citizens of the state are slaves of political parties, nor that the individual is helpless in the matter of reform. All organizations, whether large or small, reflect the character of their members; the point is, that it is more difficult for the individual to influence and reform a large organization than a small one. Yet only through the mediumship of individuals can reform eventually be brought about, even when it requires changes in the character of the association itself.

Early Forms of Political Organization. A review of the historical development of states, shows that one of the most striking changes that has taken place has been the increase in the number of persons permitted active participation in political life. A democratic form of government in very large states has been a comparatively recent development. In past times the organization of the state tended to follow the divisions of social classes. Persons who held the high offices in the state were of those who possessed the wealth and other social privileges. This situation resulted from the fact that, in a great majority of cases, the state organization had been the outcome of war and conquest. A conquering people, whether settling in the territory of the conquered or ruling it through subordinates, naturally formed a superior social class and, exploiting the natives economically, took possession of the government to make effective their demands. Most of the older states are actually survivals of the period when conquerors ruled for their own benefit rather than for

the general welfare. And the evolution of states has been towards a more general recognition of the rights of the whole people, as over against the selfish interests of particular classes or individuals. Progress has been slow towards the attainment of a complete state of democracy, that is, an organization in which each citizen has a vote in determining the policy of the government, and in which the acts of the government are undertaken to promote the general welfare.

Modern Concepts of the State. From the modern point of view some form of organization which does carry out the idea of democracy, at least in spirit and in intent, would seem to fulfil the real purpose of a state. Governments which are controlled by the few, and are manipulated for the personal interests of the powerful, can be only perversions of the idea of the state. Although it may be excusable for the more intelligent element to assume direction of affairs when the masses are ignorant, it is never excusable for them to be guided by any narrower consideration than that of the general welfare. We have come to expect, therefore, that the state should act for the welfare of the people as a whole, and that the measures it undertakes should receive the sanction of the people as a whole. For our present theory of government, which is based both upon historical experience and upon reason, is that the state will only be certain to act for the general welfare when the final authority rests in the hands of the whole people, and those people are both free and intelligent. We are accustomed to speak glibly of the right of the individual to have a voice in the affairs of the government, taking the point of view of the individual; but, if we take the point of view of the organization, we shall conclude that this participation of the individual is not so much a right as it is a duty, or rather a prerequisite for the success of the government.

It is true, to be sure, that there have been instances of absolute monarchs of high purpose and broad outlook who have ruled in the interests of the people; but in the last resort they have done little to bring about conditions of greater equality, or to alter either their own favorable position of authority or that of the privileged classes. It is noteworthy,

however, that a well-disposed sovereign with absolute power can put promptly into operation reforms which come much more slowly when they depend upon the initiative, or even the assent, of the masses of the people. For this reason some people, in the interests of a powerful and effective administration, have favored a "benevolent despot" who could enforce reform measures without the long and tedious process of educating the masses of the people to inaugurate and support them. But history has shown us that, however efficient one despot may be, a succession of despots has never continued to show a benevolent spirit; so that the gains realized from the public-spirited measures of one are likely soon to be lost in the selfish acts of another. Furthermore, although in a democracy progress may seem slow, there has always been some advantage in a system which makes progress slowly, especially if it is a system which educates the people. In fact the education of the masses is an end in itself; and reforms through political action are never certain to be enduring unless the people are trained to appreciate their value.

Defects of a Democratic Form of Government. If the foregoing analysis gives a true account of the functions of the state and of the type of government which will presumably accomplish its purposes, then our next problem is to ascertain the extent to which the purposes of the state are actually realized in our present democratic organization. Does the modern state rule for the benefit of the whole body of the people? If not, is it because democracy is a failure; or is it because after all we may not have achieved democracy?

The evidence seems to show that in democratic governments many measures are inaugurated for the general welfare; but wise measures are interspersed with foolish and inadequate ones, and acts for the general welfare are likely to be offset by others devised for mere class or partisan purposes, or for local or individual gain. So the general impression left from a study of democracies is that they are still far from fulfilling satisfactorily the basic ideals of the state. If we analyze the causes of these defects we may trace them to two sources:

first, to imperfections still inherent in society itself; and, second, to the inferior quality of individuals in power.

Defects in the social organization. If we analyze carefully the broad social defects involved, we are at once led to the conclusion that society itself is not a democracy, as that term is ordinarily understood. And, if society is not a democracy, then naturally a state government growing out of it cannot be a true democracy. In previous chapters it was shown that society is still divided into classes characterized by great differences in economic position, intelligence, and general mode of life. Now it is inevitable that differences like these should bring about marked differences in power and influence among the different groups. Naturally the more influential classes will gain a disproportionate number of the important political positions and will rule, to some extent at least, for their own advantage.

Taking the most lenient attitude towards the situation, and assuming that the individuals in power are not consciously self-seeking nor lacking in public spirit, the conclusion is nevertheless unavoidable that, representing as they do a particular class, the interests of their own groups will be more carefully advanced than those of the less powerful classes. For example, if farmers or unskilled laborers lack representation in the government, their interests will not be cared for to the same extent as will, perhaps, those of bankers or of the industrial classes who may be ably represented. Or, if the negroes lack representation, their special needs are likely to be forgotten, even though the government officials are in general solicitous for the welfare of all. Just so long as marked differences in status exist in society, which carry with them great variations in influence, no state will rule entirely for the general welfare.

Before the attainment of a true democracy will be possible, then, extreme class distinctions in society must be superseded by a condition of greater equalization of opportunity and of influence. Only when there shall exist a high general level of intelligence, and equable division of wealth, can representa-

tion and influence in the state be uniform, and the interests of all parts of society receive just and equal consideration. Of course individual differences will always continue to exist, even when there is equality of opportunity, and these will lead to inequality in influence; but such differences as these are not undesirable. It is those inequalities resulting from marked differences in the position of whole classes of a population that are inconsistent with the principles of democracy. True democratic government is possible in a state only after the attainment of reasonable equality of opportunity in society as a whole.

Inferior quality of state officials. While those defects of the state which allow the use of power for class or private interests, rather than for the general welfare, are traceable primarily to the existence of social inequalities, those which permit inefficiency and misdirection of energy are due to the inferior quality of individuals holding the power. An ideal state would require, not merely that society should be democratic, but that positions of power should be held by superior individuals.

There are several reasons why government officials are liable to fall below the standards requisite. In the first place the attitude of the average citizen towards governmental positions is not always the right one. The task of directing the affairs of a large body of people intelligently and impartially is of course an onerous one, and requires more than an ordinary degree of concentration and devotion on the part of those entrusted with the administration of power. Yet the fact is that, because personal competition is so keen and the desire for social recognition so strong, positions of authority in the state are often sought for social prestige, and sometimes even for material gain. Thus love of power and the desire for social distinction are likely to characterize the personnel of a government, instead of the sense of responsibility and the desire to render service—qualities so requisite for promotion of the general welfare. This attitude tends to produce a selfish and autocratic administration, ruling primarily for the glory of the administrators. Although in democracies this point of

view is common, it is not inevitable. Its presence depends largely upon the type of persons competing for office. There are plenty of individuals in modern states who would govern for the public interests without thought of private gain, if they were elected or appointed to office without initiative or effort on their own part. But existing conditions tend to throw the power into the hands of a mediocre, self-seeking class, instead of one with superior social sense and broad vision. This disappointing attitude on the part of public officials towards their duties is therefore closely connected with a second cause of inefficiency in democracies, namely, the attraction of inferiors rather than superiors to the positions of power.

Any explanation of the presence of inferior instead of superior men in official positions calls for an examination of the essential character of the political organization. Normally, in any important organization, the superiors will gradually rise to the top. But certainly no organization is more important than the state; therefore, if this simple principle of selection does not hold good there, it must indicate some serious defect in the organization of the state itself, or else in the larger association of society. To get at a solution of the difficulty, we must ask ourselves why individuals choose a particular occupation anyway. Or, if this makes the problem seem too general and complicated, we can at least consider some of their more obvious reasons for choice. Apparently individuals select those pursuits which offer the fullest scope for their special abilities; that is, they choose the kind of work which seems to them the most attractive, taking into consideration of course the remuneration which it affords and the possibility it offers for advancement. If now we apply these usual reasons for choice to the occupation of politics, so called, we begin to realize why government offices fail to attract the able. In the first place, politics offers no certainty of a permanent career at all, even to those who have the requisite abilities for it. In the United States at least, it is not regarded as a profession for which a man could deliberately prepare himself with reasonable certainty of a permanent position or with the expectation of preferment. Political offices

have rather been viewed as temporary positions, which could easily be filled by the average person without special training; and positions, moreover, which should not be monopolized by the few but should be passed around, so that as many as possible might enjoy the benefits of office. It is to be hoped that this point of view is losing ground; but it is still so common that politics is not included in the list of professions which a young man may deliberately choose and prepare for.

It is true that many do find a permanent life work in politics; but this is so often the result of chance, or of questionable methods, that able men are likely to be repelled rather than attracted by the dubious prospects it offers. A few conditions commonly present may serve to illustrate the ordinary political situation. For instance, our method of government by parties is in itself often sufficient to discourage the political aspirations of the ambitious. Even when the country as a whole is rather evenly divided into parties, these divisions do not hold good for particular districts. One district may so continuously favor a particular party that no member of the minority party could hope to begin a political career there by obtaining an elective office. It is true that the organizing of the civil service was an attempt to lessen the evils of the spoils system, and to make positions in the administrative department more permanent and promotions more in accordance with ability. But the positions covered by the civil service are for the most part minor positions of routine. They do not offer a means by which able men could expect to attain responsible offices in governmental service. The higher positions are usually controlled by party organizations, and are bestowed as a reward for special service. Here again the methods that have to be employed to attain them are not always pleasant. A candidate for an elective office, or an official who wishes to retain a position already won, often finds it necessary to organize and manipulate the mass of the voters by means so dubious as to be distasteful to men of high principles.

Even if an office holder does succeed in retaining his position long enough to consider it a permanent vocation, there is

no certainty that promotion will come as a natural reward for administrative ability. Party influence and local claims have to be considered, as well as aptitude for office. All this does not imply, however, that public offices are always filled by men of inferior ability. Many officials, especially those in appointive positions, such as judges of the supreme court and cabinet officers, have on the whole been meritorious. But those who have held elective offices, not excluding even the chief executive, have not been uniformly men of outstanding ability. Indeed, there have been periods in the history of the country when the presidential office, which calls for men of the highest possible attainments, has actually been filled by men of very ordinary capacity. The reason in this instance, however, is not that the office itself is not attractive even to men who are not making politics a profession; but rather because it is dominated by party rule.

A political party, it must be remembered, belongs to that large type of association where personalities do not count so much as perfection of organization. The outcome of a contest at the polls depends upon the strength and efficiency of organization; and a candidate for office who possesses an outstanding personality, though sometimes wished on a party, is not particularly welcomed by professional politicians. They are searching for a winner, and, according to their calculations, a rather negative personality, one which will arouse no strong enemies or unfavorable criticism, is the safest candidate at the polls. Moreover, they know that such a candidate will not be so likely to threaten party solidarity nor to weaken party discipline. They feel, perhaps rightly, that it is safer to rely upon organization than upon personality to win an election. But their policy may after all be a mistaken one, for actually the mass of the people seem rather to be attracted by a strong and independent personality. If a candidate does alienate one kind of voter, that loss may be more than compensated for by his attraction of another type.

Nevertheless, aside from the question of immediate success, an independent candidate of strong personality is not so pleasing in the long run to party leaders, for the reason that he is

less amenable to party discipline and altogether too likely to insist upon reforms. Now reform measures may be all very well in party platforms; but putting them into practice is likely to be destructive to the organization and discouraging to favorite methods and practices which shrink from the light of publicity. It is evident, then, that for various reasons political office cannot be regarded as a permanent career, and that preferment may not be to the most deserving.

Remuneration is small. But another practical reason why public life is not attractive is that the material rewards are usually much less than those obtainable in private enterprise. This fact in itself might not be a deterrent. If political offices carried with them great social distinction, and if the work in itself were attractive, a somewhat smaller scale of remuneration than that to be expected in private work might still suffice to attract, but the reward cannot be too low. Sometimes the salaries for public service, notably in the case of foreign ambassadors, are so small that only those possessing an independent fortune can be considered candidates.

The effect of too low a scale of remuneration for public office in the United States has been unfortunate in many ways. It has tended to bring into office men of inferior ability, those who could not hope to earn large rewards in other lines of work; and, also, it has attracted unprincipled men, who have sought political power for purposes of profit through graft and other forms of corruption. As soon as a party organization gets into the control of unprincipled and self-seeking men, it is too late to attract the efficient by means of higher salaries. The larger salaries would merely become absorbed by the leaders for themselves or for their subordinates. To avoid the evils attendant on greed, remedy has sometimes been sought in the entire abolition of pay for certain public positions; but a real cure could be effected only by changing the type of persons in control.

However, inadequate remuneration is not the only factor which may detract from the desirability of holding public office. A public servant who may be doing his utmost for the public welfare may, where party antagonisms are strong, be

subjected to such vicious attacks from opponents and the press as to render his position almost intolerable; so that many people who are well adapted to government positions feel that, not only are the salaries paid inadequate, but genuine effort for the public good is so little appreciated that they prefer a more peaceful life in a less conspicuous and vulnerable position.

State officials are not specialists. The foregoing are merely a few of the reasons for the failure of the public service to attract the more prominent and able men. This failure, whatever the reasons, is doubtless one of the chief causes of the weakness and inefficiency of the state organization. Another cause, and one which will be of increasing importance as time goes on, is that public officials are not specialists. This condition of affairs is partly at least a survival of an early period when political duties were not arduous. Then a representative who understood local conditions and was acquainted with the sentiments of his constituents possessed all the requisites necessary for an acceptable legislator; and administrative officers themselves needed little special training, for they were engaged in tasks comparatively simple and easy to perform. Whether or not these qualifications really served the purposes of a simple social organization or not, they certainly are not adequate for the duties of a complex society.

In modern times the task of legislation is to direct the development of an economic and social organization which has become extremely intricate and complex, and to correct existing evils. It would seem, then, that to accomplish these ends legislation must be based on a thorough understanding of the organization of society and the laws of social development; and the qualifications for acceptable legislators or administrators should include not only general intelligence, but acquaintance with social laws and social conditions, and also specialized training in the technique of government and in methods of making legislation effective. But, insistent as we are in demanding trained specialists in other fields, in the important field of government we still hold to the old idea that the average untrained citizen is quite competent to direct the affairs of the state. We have always required expert

knowledge for professional work, and we are beginning to give it its true value in business. Why, then, are we so slow in realizing how difficult are the tasks of directing social forces and of instituting social reforms? Continual tinkering with social conditions by persons ignorant of social laws is likely to do more harm than good. Reforms should be attempted only with the greatest caution after an intelligent investigation of all the factors involved.

Although the increasing demand for specialists in new lines of work has produced also new facilities for specialized training, little has been done to provide training for government positions, even though the need is a pressing one. However, although specialists in legislation are needed, it would not be advisable to have all legislators persons of similar type or training. Better results would be obtained from a variety of specialists with different interests; but they should all know something of the social sciences, and all should be trained to understand the purposes and probable effects of legislation.

Summary. The above analysis of the defects of the modern democratic state show that they are serious; nevertheless they should not be overestimated. The state does get along—some would prefer to say it blunders along, or muddles through —and it accomplishes much for the general welfare. But, though it passes many desirable measures, it still permits much unwise and hasty legislation; and it sponsors laws for the promotion of sectional and class interests. The latter are due to inequalities in power and to the influence of classes in society; and the former are the result of ignorance and inexperience on the part of officials and the general public alike. A body of legislators ignorant of social laws has to attack social maladies by the trial and error method. They begin with some plausible scheme, usually that of direct suppression enforced by severe penalties; and if this fails they try another, or give the whole problem up as beyond their power of solution.

The Problem of Improving the Democratic State. To many people the imperfections of the political organization are so glaring and so persistent that they raise the question seriously as to whether democracy is not after all a demon-

strated failure, and would not better be replaced by some more autocratic form of authority. They question whether, in a complicated form of social organization, a people can actually govern themselves; or whether they must not necessarily be governed by a small group who have the training and the qualities which fit them for this work. The Fascists, for instance, claim that they are evolving a superior type of government. So far, however, no system better than a democracy has been demonstrated. All other known systems lack some of the characteristics now believed indispensable to an ideal form of government. Since no substitute system is available, then, the problem is to correct the faults of democracy and at the same time to retain its desirable features.

Defects to be remedied. One of the chief faults of the democratic form of government is, as we have already seen, the tendency to idealize the average citizen and accept him off hand as a competent guide in the affairs of state. Instead of demanding expert knowledge and specialized training in our office holders, we are satisfied with narrow-minded, untrained men who nevertheless feel sure of themselves and who are jealous of their privileges. This fault has been responsible for much of the discouraging waste and inefficiency obvious in popular government, and so difficult to overcome. Another defect of popular government is the slowness of its procedure, due to its ponderous and unwieldy size. It is difficult to get it started; but when once aroused it becomes the dread of its political keepers, because it is so hard to control. A despotism is a lithe and active being compared with a democracy. A despot could have a measure perfected and in operation while a democracy was still ruminating over its desirability.

Advantages to be retained. Among those characteristics of popular government which ought to be retained is first of all the feeling of satisfaction, which every one of its citizens may enjoy, of actually being a part of the state organization. Even though a citizen may not be very active, his membership in the body politic gives him, nevertheless, a pleasant sense of security and well-being. When the masses are excluded from participation in political life, inevitably they become sus-

picious and mutinous. Even when the disfranchised are not actually oppressed—though they usually are—they blame the government for all the evils they experience; and, what is still more serious, their sense of exasperation keeps pace with their feeling of helplessness. But when, as in a democracy, they are allowed participation in governmental affairs, they find an outlet for their displeasure. A democracy not only affords them opportunity to make known their grievances, it also gives them a hand in choosing and applying the remedies.

Another virtue of a democracy is to be found in the possibilities it offers for political education. The enfranchised citizen is encouraged to take an interest in current political and social problems. He listens to arguments and discussions. Although his decisions may not always be reasonable, gradually his judgment improves and he becomes more adept at citizenship through the opportunities and responsibilities offered him. This process of education works slowly and is doubtless faulty in itself; but it must be regarded as an important source of training for efficient citizenship, which is denied subjects of a despotic government.

Greater social equality desirable. This whole problem of correcting the evils of democratic government without eliminating its advantages involves two measures of reform not wholly unconnected. The first is the achievement of greater equality of power and influence in social and economic life. This is largely an economic question, and has already been discussed in the previous chapter. So it will suffice to say here that progress towards greater social equality does seem to be making perceptible headway; at least, it is evident that the poorer classes are slowly improving their standards of living, broadening their outlook, and enlarging their activities. As the conditions of the so-called laboring classes improve, so will their power and influence increase, as is evidenced by the position the labor party has now attained in industrial countries. With greater social equality, political life will become more truly representative, and governmental power will be directed more frequently towards the general welfare.

More general education needed. The second measure of reform is improvement in general education of the masses. This reform also is in the process of gradual accomplishment. The schools are performing their work more and more efficiently in training the new generation; and, in addition to this formal system of education, other supplementary means, such as newspapers, periodicals, and public discussions are multiplying and reaching a larger and larger part of the population. These various educational measures are helping the average citizen to understand the problems of the state, and are increasing his fitness to pronounce upon them intelligently. Nevertheless, while a better general education does make the average person a better citizen, it is hardly sufficient of itself to prepare him to become an efficient legislator or administrative officer under the present requirements.

If, therefore, the education which the average citizen receives is not sufficient to ensure an intelligent and efficient state government, is the conclusion inevitable that inefficiency is a weakness inherent in popular government, or is there some means that can be utilized to overcome the defect? It seems certain that the democratic form of government, as that term is commonly understood, does show a weakness which makes it unsuited to a large and complicated society, and that, in the interests of efficiency, the old conception of democracy will have to undergo some modification.

A new conception of democracy. If still another means of reform does exist, it must be of a more fundamental nature than the two just discussed, and will involve a change in our conception of the meaning of democracy, or self-government. We have commonly understood self-government to mean the direct exercise of power by the people themselves; that is, we have expected them to perform the actual work of government, or to take the responsibility of making decisions, either directly or through the mediumship of representatives elected to carry out their views. In accordance with this conception, the attempt has been made to reform abuses by the introduction of measures which should be still more democratic, even to the

extent of providing for the more frequent participation of the people as a whole in the settlement of public questions by such devices as the initiative and referendum. But now, at last, we are coming to realize that problems of such difficulty and complexity as those occurring in modern states can never be settled satisfactorily by the masses through such democratic methods. Problems of economic policy and finance cannot be solved intelligently by direct appeal to the people; nor can governmental departments involving complicated problems of policy be administered by the average untrained citizen.

The new conception of democracy must be based on the realization that political freedom does not involve the actual transaction of business by the people themselves, but is more ably exercised through intelligent choice of representatives, to whom shall be entrusted power of initiative and of action. These representatives should possess that specialized knowledge and training which would make them competent to work on their own initiative; and they should not be hampered, as are our present legislators, by continual interference from their constituents on minor questions. Though the interests of the people would be sufficiently safeguarded through their choice of candidates, they should still have the power to determine general policies, either through frequency of elections or by means of a system of recall. To be sure, there is no guarantee that, if this change were inaugurated, experts would be chosen for office; but, with the abandonment of the theory that popular freedom requires direct action by the people, the belief that public service work requires specialists would be likely to spread. And if specialists were once given preference, it is to be hoped that they would be able to demonstrate their superior fitness for governmental office.

A democratic government administered by specialists would help to correct also that annoying defect of democracy, its indecision and slowness of action. If experts were in control, they could be trusted with considerable power and freedom of action. Those numerous checks and balances in the governmental machinery, which are supposed to restrain the suspicious individuals whom at present we elect but do not trust,

could be removed; and business could be transacted more directly and expeditiously by experts. But this change in policy, however desirable, should not be pushed too fast; for representatives too far in advance would lose touch with the masses of the people, and would endanger the educative value of a popular form of government. The leaders should lead, but not desert, their constituents. To retain self-government the people must be kept well informed, and they must in the last resort determine the general policy to be followed through their selection of representatives.

Generally it is the problems that are difficult of solution which require the attention of experts; and certainly there are problems of state not less difficult than those to be found in economic or scientific fields. The sooner democracies recognize the need of trained experts to administer their affairs, the sooner will they approach efficiency and overcome their most serious defect. An efficient democracy, that is, a combination of popular will and of expert opinion, must be regarded as the most desirable form of government known.

Conclusion. While the imperfections of the government are to a considerable extent the result of defects in its mechanism, the mistake has been made in the past of placing too much emphasis on weaknesses of this kind. In our methods of reform we have attempted to overcome abuses by adopting new rules, or by altering the form of an organization, when the real difficulty lay much deeper. All the various institutions in society are so interdependent that imperfections in one tend to spread to others; and some of the most serious political evils are reflections of unhealthy conditions in other parts of the social system. Those institutions most closely bound up with the political organization, in the sense of affecting its character and efficiency, are the economic organization on the one hand, and the family and the school on the other. Improvements in the economic organization will help to make the state more democratic; and improvements in the family and in the school will improve the quality and the intelligence of the democratic population.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Make a list of the various activities of your town or city government. Of your state government. Of the Federal Government.
2. Are these functions increasing or decreasing? Give reasons.
3. Describe the form of government of your town or city. Do you consider it efficient?
4. Describe the form of your state government.
5. Point out the chief differences between your state government and the Federal Government.
6. What changes do you think would make your state government more efficient?
7. Make a report on the system of nominating candidates for office in your state.
8. What is the meaning of democracy?
9. Do you think we have complete democracy in either the state or Federal Government?
10. In what ways is an absolute form of government more efficient than a democratic form?
11. What are the advantages of a democratic form of government?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Bates, F. G., and Field, O. P., *State Government,* Chapter 1.
Beach, Walter G., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapter 26.
Clow, Frederick R., *Principles of Educational Sociology,* Chapter 10.
Dealey, James Q., *The Development of the State,* Chapter 15.
Eldridge, S., and Clark, C. DeW., *Major Problems of Democracy,* Chapter 19.
Ogg, F. A., and Ray, P. O., *Introduction to American Government,* Chapter 2.
Woods, Robert A., *The City Wilderness,* Chapter 6.
——*Americans in Process,* Chapter 6.

CHAPTER IX

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The Administration of Justice Requires a Complex Organization. In every country a complex organization, including courts, prosecuting officials, police, jails, prisons and reformatories is instituted for the purpose of preserving order and dispensing justice. This work consists in settling disputes arising between individuals, or associations, and in protecting the persons and property of individuals from the depredations of the criminal classes. In as much as the principles of justice followed by the courts are derived, not from abstract formulæ, but from laws or long-established customs, it would be correct to say that the duty of the courts is to see that laws are observed and that proper punishment is inflicted upon those who transgress them.

It is evident, then, that the courts and related institutions form an indispensable instrument for the peace and welfare of society. Our problem here, as in the discussion of other institutions, is to ascertain how efficiently their functions are performed and what may be their defects.

This organization for the administration of justice is so complex that any detailed consideration of all the component parts would be entirely beyond the scope of this book. The problem of the treatment and reform of criminals, for instance, is in itself so intricate as to form a separate social science; and that subject will not be discussed. We shall confine ourselves rather to an estimate of the general efficiency of the judicial organization as a whole.

Methods of Administering Justice Have Greatly Improved. For our purpose it will not be necessary to enter into any historical account of the early systems of justice, or rather of injustice, and their gradual replacement by more rational

and equitable forms. As far as the development which has taken place is concerned, it will suffice merely to note that we have gained in two significant ways. First, we have, supposedly at least, abandoned the system of administering justice by superstitious methods. For example, we no longer test a man's innocence by throwing him into the water and, if he floats, declaring him guilty, and, if he sinks, declaring him innocent and worth saving. Nowadays we try to ascertain a person's innocence or guilt by actual evidence submitted to a competent court. Secondly, we have in democratic countries got beyond the possibility of the infliction of arbitrary punishment by an absolute ruler for his own personal safety or for material gain. In place of the old tyrannical procedure, we now provide for the accused a trial by a jury of men belonging to his own class in society, so that any danger of persecution or oppression will be removed from the judicial process. Indeed, so repellent are those ancient methods to our modern ideas of justice and liberty, that in the United States we have embodied in our constitution a category of the rights and principles of justice which every citizen may enjoy.

In our present discussion we shall assume that the basic principles of justice are guaranteed by the fundamental law of the constitution, and also that the acts passed by the legislatures are on the whole fair and equitable. When it comes to carrying out these laws, the question of the efficiency of the courts should not be confused with the efficiency or desirability of the laws themselves; and the courts should not be blamed, as is too frequently the case, for faults of the legislative department of the government.

Standards of Efficiency in the Administration of Justice. As a preliminary to this discussion, it may well be asked just what is meant by the efficient administration of justice. In as much as there are many kinds of law, this question could easily be made a complicated one; but it may be answered satisfactorily from the point of view of criminal law alone, because that includes all the essential principles involved. In case one person injures another, for example, by theft or by murder, thereby violating the law of the land, we expect that

the police will discover and arrest the criminal, that the prosecuting attorney will present the evidence against him in court, and that at the same time the accused will be given every reasonable opportunity for defense, and finally that the courts will arrive quickly and impartially at a just decision. If the accused is found guilty, we expect a penalty to be imposed within the limits provided by the law, with due consideration for the rights of the criminal and for the broader interests of society itself. The simple principles of justice here exemplified, which specifically cover criminal cases, could also be made applicable to other departments of justice, such as civil and administrative cases.

Defects in the Police System. If now we test by these standards the conditions actually existing, we shall find many grounds for dissatisfaction and criticism. With regard to the apprehension of criminals, we have to admit that the police fail to ferret out law breakers as expeditiously as could be desired.

Although the real service of the police force cannot be estimated from figures, nevertheless a few examples from criminal records will help us to draw some conclusion concerning the efficiency of the police and of the courts together. In 1918, there were 7,667 culpable homicides in the United States, and 85 legal executions. In Detroit, in 1917, there were 89 murders, 104 arrests, and 14 convictions. There were also in the same city 843 robberies, 494 arrests, and 115 convictions. In New York City, in 1913, there were 323 homicides, 185 arrests, and 80 convictions.[1] In Chicago, in 1926, there were 1,762 burglaries for which 430 persons were indicted, 396 of whom were discharged.[2]

These few examples are representative of conditions in this country. And while the failures to bring criminals to justice cannot be ascribed entirely to laxity in police departments, that there should be so many does not indicate great efficiency on the part of the police. That they are not more efficient is due to several causes. In the first place, the police are not

[1] Fosdick, Raymond B., *American Police Systems.* Ch. 1.
[2] Cavanagh, Marcus, *The Criminal and His Allies,* p. 4.

selected from a class of persons of high grade intellectually; and, in the second place, those chosen do not receive adequate training for their work. Traditionally the personal qualities which have been considered essential to the police force have been physical, such as size, strength, and health, rather than mental acuteness. Moreover, men of suitable ability have not regarded the police service as an attractive vocation and have found better opportunities in other lines. More disastrous still, appointments to the service have ordinarily been made for political reasons, and among these fitness for the work is never sure of a place.

The inadequacy of training for policemen may be attributed largely to the apathy of the public, and to its failure to appreciate the qualities requisite for efficient police service. For a long time the idea seemed prevalent that crime meant chiefly such acts as assault or robbery, and that, therefore, patrol of the streets by awe-inspiring giants would be efficacious in discouraging lawlessness and in capturing daring criminals. As soon as we began to realize that the more serious crimes were usually carefully planned by professional criminals more clever than the police, we saw the necessity of creating a more effective organization based on scientific methods. So special departments for the systematic training of detectives have been established, and, in addition, training schools for ordinary police officers are now being organized.

But inefficiency and lack of intelligence are by no means all of the defects to be found in the police force. From the point of view of the achievement of justice and the protection of the public, the chief weakness in the force is the liability of its members to corruption, resulting often in alliances between the police and criminals. Criminals are not uncommonly protected in their depredations provided they will share their gains with the police; and such corruption has frequently extended even to persons in the higher positions. Moreover, cases have been known where convicts discharged from prison have been prevented from settling down to honest occupations, but required to continue their old work of thieving in order that police officers might share in the booty. The public,

through this sort of perversion, is exploited instead of protected by the agents of law and order. The position of a police officer is so authoritative in his district that he can easily profit by the criminal acts of others.

Notwithstanding these numerous criticisms—most of them well deserved—to which the police force has been subjected, it should be said in its favor that the superior class of police officers are much better informed concerning criminals and their methods, and are much more efficient in detecting the instigators of crime, than is generally believed. They are assisted of course by the criminal records available to all the members of the police department, but police officers do not depend entirely upon these; sometimes they have a personal acquaintance with criminals, keep track of their movements, and may even be familiar with the particular methods which individual criminals employ in their work. Because of this personal knowledge the police are often morally certain of the person or persons responsible for a crime, even though no arrests are made. Often it is impossible to obtain just the kind of evidence necessary for conviction in the courts; and then the police think it better to refrain from making premature arrests, since if they do make them the criminal is almost certain to be acquitted. The methods and technicalities by which criminals can escape conviction are so numerous that the police have often been discouraged in their attempts to bring criminals to justice.

These instances are cited to show that the courts should bear a part of the blame for the failure to apprehend criminals. Their shortcomings react upon the police department to increase its ineffectiveness. Nevertheless, though the blame should be divided, it would be altogether wrong to exonerate the police from all responsibility for the failure of criminal justice. A real need exists for the reform of our police system and an improvement in its efficiency. The relatively small amount of crime in England, as compared with the United States, is attributable not only to the greater efficiency of their courts but to the superiority of their police system as well. So before the blame for the miscarriage of justice can

be placed on any other department, our police department must be able to demonstrate that it has become a dependable and efficient agency for the maintenance of law and order.

Reforms Needed in the Police System. The reorganization needed would be promoted, in the first place, by the appointment of a new type of police commissioner, one who would be fully cognizant of the character and importance of his duties, and who would also be entirely removed from political influence. An independent commissioner would really be in a position to reorganize the service; he should be able to select a better type of police officers and inspire them with new ideals of service. These officers should be given a thorough course of training for their duties to acquaint them with the most approved scientific methods of procedure, and also to foster in them high ideals. Incidentally, larger appropriations should be made for the support of the department, so that these reforms could be carried out. Given a superior type of men, trained in scientific methods, and the other faults of the department would tend to disappear.

Defects in the Courts. Turning next to the central organization of the system of justice, the courts themselves, we have to inquire if the accused, when brought before them, is assured of a fair, speedy, and impartial trial; and if, in case of conviction, a just sentence is imposed. The evidence goes to show that in this country trials are far from speedy; and, to the layman at least, they do not always seem to be conducted according to the requirements of justice. Is this failure in the administration of justice to be attributed, as it so often is in the case of the police system, to inferior quality of officials, or to bribery, or to any outside corrupt influence? In general it appears that these are not the causes of the miscarriage of justice in the courts, though bribery has not been unknown there, and in many cases court officials have doubtless been of inferior intelligence.

Technicalities of the law. The difficulty here seems rather to be due to the restrictive rules of procedure and that mass of technicalities which have accumulated and which tend to thwart rather than to facilitate the administration of justice.

Restrictive rules appear in all stages of the proceedings. For example, the selection of a jury has become a long and difficult task. Yet, hampering as the requirements for selection are, they still permit the inclusion of emotional and prejudiced members, instead of assuring a body of persons capable of voting strictly according to evidence. Again, the functions of the judge have become so restricted that he is now little more than a chairman of proceedings; and sometimes his lack of power thwarts the ends of justice. Also, rules with regard to the admission of evidence have become complicated and often unreasonable. Particularly open to criticism, too, is the admission of the testimony of expert witnesses, because experts are employed by each of the interested parties, and necessarily their testimony is conflicting and often misleading. It has been suggested that the appointment of impartial experts by the court would be the simplest means of bringing out the actual facts. Then, again, the pleas of the counsel to the jury are often attempts to obtain a verdict through appeal to emotions, without regard to the claims of justice. The frequent success of such appeals has led many to believe that a judge could form a more impartial estimate of the guilt or innocence of the accused than can a jury. The requirement that the verdict of the jury must be unanimous is also criticized as an impediment to the attainment of quick and just verdicts. Finally, the conditions upon which appeals to a higher court may be made are entirely upon questions of law rather than of fact; and they involve so many petty technicalities that the simple demands of justice seem to be ignored.

Delays of the law. The combination of all these various technicalities leads to one of the greatest evils of all, that is, the slow process of the administration of justice. Cases in this country may drag along for several years before they are finally settled. While it is evident enough that the appellate courts, lacking facilities to handle all the cases coming before them, are deluged with work; it is also true that, if our methods were simpler, fewer cases would come before them, and those which they did review could be dispatched more rapidly.

Reasonable promptness in the disposal of cases is essential

to the cause of justice. Delay ordinarily assists the defense and hampers the prosecution. If much time elapses between the commission of a crime and the final trial, important witnesses may have died or disappeared; the events in the case will be less clearly remembered; witnesses may have changed their viewpoints; and, what is more important still, the public will probably have forgotten the victim and have shifted its sympathies to the accused now fighting for his life or his freedom. This policy of delay, of which the defense makes use, owing to the fact that chances of acquittal improve as time elapses, greatly weakens the force of law and diminishes the fear of punishment as a preventive of crime. Since so many criminals fail of conviction, the tendency is to try to counteract this weakness of the court by increasing the severity of the penalties for those who are convicted. This is probably poor policy. Swift trials and certain punishment would be more repressive than uncertainty of conviction accompanied with occasional heavy penalties.

It is said that delays of justice favor the accused, but it would be much more accurate to say that they favor the accused if he is guilty. If the accused is innocent and able to prove it, every delay of course works a hardship. An innocent person unjustly accused may have to serve a long undeserved jail sentence, while waiting trial, with no redress. A long-drawn-out trial with its possible appeals is an expensive luxury at best. Court procedure is, of course, better than a prison sentence, but it is much less desirable than freedom. Besides the material considerations involved, the good name of a wrongly accused defendant is bound to suffer, even though he does obtain a final acquittal. An impartial and speedy trial is the least that society owes the accused.

The question of favoritism. Even more important to the accused is the assurance of a just trial. Any estimate of how impartial our courts really are is difficult to make. It would be too optimistic to assert that justice is administered with absolute impartiality, yet the situation in the United States does not at all resemble that in societies where classes or castes have recognized positions before the courts, and where

penalties are imposed in accordance with social standing. Nor is it commonly charged against our courts that a miscarriage of justice through bribery is anything more than an exceptional case. Such inequalities in our administration of justice are due to more subtle causes, and are therefore harder to remedy. Although the wealthy may not actually bribe, they are frequently able to use their resources in perfectly legal ways to counteract the ends of justice. They can employ the most able counsel, they can hire experts for special testimony, and they are able to take advantage of every technicality of the law for appeal or dismissal of a case. In short, the rich can make the most of legal technicalities for purposes of defense, while the poor are unable to do so. The latter may even have to be satisfied with counsel assigned by the court; and the court's attorneys are not only bound to be inferior to those retained by the rich, but they are often inspired with an unaccountable sense of justice, instead of being moved by a well-paid passion to free their client at any cost. To overcome this danger of unequal equipment for defense and better to safeguard the rights of the poor, there has been established in some districts the office of public defender, as an offset to that of public prosecutor. So far it appears that this reform has accomplished excellent results.

Of course the advantages enjoyed by the rich before the courts are similar to those they are likely to possess in other departments of life, and are not wholly attributable to the machinery of justice itself.

A psychological, as well as a material factor, may also enter into the problem of favoritism. It is inevitable that it should be more difficult to convict a person occupying a high position in society, or one who has supposedly been a useful member of the community, than one who occupies an inferior position and is of little influence. Yet the occasional conviction of persons who have enjoyed the respect and confidence of society shows that justice is far from perverted; and the apparent inequalities of treatment are probably due to subordinate causes.

The penalties imposed. Another type of inequality before

the law is the wide variation in sentences imposed for similar offenses. The determination of the proper penalty for a particular crime is a part of the large problem of punishment and reformation, which is outside the scope of the present discussion. Most criminal experts believe that punishment should not be uniform for a particular offense, but should depend upon the personality of the criminal and the circumstances attending the crime. But where inequalities in sentences do exist, the courts have not ordinarily been influenced by these considerations. Few courts make any study of criminals from the point of view of possible reform. They take account merely of their past criminal records and the circumstances attending the crime, and vary sentences in accordance with those factors. And such variations in sentence are in accordance with the law and cannot be objected to. Objectionable inequalities are those due to variations in sentences imposed by the same judge at different times, none of which have anything to do with true individualization of punishment. Though the variations may amount to a difference of several years in the sentence, they are traceable to particular prejudices or attitudes of mind of the judges, or merely to temporary moods aroused by the irritation of minor events. For example, Sutherland says,[1] "One judge in New York placed 7 per cent. of those convicted on probation; another judge dealing with offenders of the same type placed 40 per cent. on probation. In Cleveland, 6 per cent. of the cases before one judge were nolle prossed, and 43 per cent. before another judge. One judge suspended sentences in 31 per cent. of the cases before him, and another in 6 per cent. and as a result, 80 per cent. of the defendants plead guilty before the first, 30 per cent. before the second." Such inequalities are likely to exasperate criminals and undermine the confidence of the public in the impartiality of the courts.

It is impossible to do more than suggest here the various weaknesses of our system of justice and the reasons why so much dissatisfaction is being aroused over what are termed archaic methods of jurisprudence. To the outside observer,

[1] Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology*, p. 278.

it seems as if the development of law and judicial procedure must have been directed by persons interested in details of method rather than in broad considerations of justice; and the rules, originally intended to guarantee a fair trial, have now come to involve so many loopholes and possibilities of evasion that they can actually be used to defeat the ends of justice. A modern criminal trial resembles an arena for a contest of wits between lawyers, who, with little regard for possible innocence or guilt, are merely struggling to demonstrate their own efficiency by securing the conviction or the acquittal of the suspect.

Reforms Needed in the Court System. A thorough reorganization of our court system, such as would seem desirable in the interests of justice and efficiency, would involve many changes of detail, which could be formulated only after careful deliberation by experts. But the general lines which reforms should take are easily recognizable and follow logically from the various defects which have been outlined. Since the chief faults are due to hampering technicalities on the one hand, and to unreasonable delays on the other hand, both of which inevitably defeat the ends of justice, these obstructions in the path of justice must be removed. In addition, a new spirit of social service should be fostered in the legal profession, as it is already being fostered in the medical profession. Reforms would necessitate a revision of the rules of court procedure, an increased unity and coöperation among the courts, and an improvement in the personnel of the judges, especially those of the lower courts. And, finally, the whole judicial system should be remodelled with the special object in mind of obtaining prompter administration of justice. These various reforms and the means of bringing them about will be considered separately.

Revision of the rules of procedure. Revision of the rules of procedure involves two considerations: first, by whom the revision shall be undertaken; and, secondly, what the character of the changes should be.

At present, the regulations governing the courts are formulated by legislators, but critics have characterized this method

as an inconsistency. According to their view it is absurd that one department of the government should receive its rules from another, and then have to bear the blame for its inefficient methods of procedure. They maintain that, if the courts are to be expected to take full responsibility for their actions, they should be permitted to draw up their own regulations; and that, in as much as the judiciary contains plenty of ability among its members, they are fully capable of governing themselves and are fully cognizant of their own needs.

There is doubtless much truth in these contentions, particularly in the point that, if the courts are to assume full responsibility, they should have freedom of action. On the other hand, it may be pointed out that when the rules are made by legislators, at least they are not made by the inexperienced. Legislatures contain a larger representation from the legal profession than from any other occupation; and judiciary committees are usually composed of legal experts, who ought to be closely in touch with the needs of the judicial department.

A counter suggestion to both of these contentions is that court rules should be formulated to a greater extent by laymen. This suggestion does not arise from any desire to place important specialized matters in the hands of incompetent persons. It comes rather from the feeling that persons trained in the technique of the law are liable to be so hampered by traditions that their reforms will not go beyond petty details; that only laymen, who can view the question impartially from the outside, will be able to accomplish reforms sufficiently sweeping. The recent reform in the English law pertaining to courts of appeal was drawn up largely by laymen; and the changes instituted were radical departures from traditional methods. Some of the suggestions proved, indeed, to be quite shocking to the sensibilities of the legal mind. Yet the new system seems to work extremely well. Probably a commission composed of both laymen and lawyers would form a desirable compromise, if such a combination could ever come to agreement.

Possible reforms in the rules of procedure are so numerous

that only a few can be mentioned here; but it is certain that a large list could be formulated by any commission whose sole object was to improve the administration of justice.

The jury system. The first process in a trial, the selection of a jury, is obviously in need of reform. This has come to be such a long and wearisome procedure that in some cases it has been taken out of the hands of lawyers and given to the presiding judge. Through this change the jury can be chosen in a fraction of the time otherwise required; and probably its members are fully as competent as the average jurors, though they may not be so likely to possess those qualities which a defending counsel most desires. In some cases the addition of alternate jurors to sit with the regular jurymen during the trial has proved to be advantageous, as it allows a trial to proceed even if a juror is taken ill. It has the inconvenience, however, of increasing the number to be chosen.

In connection with the problem of reforming the jury system, the more fundamental question arises of whether a jury system itself is a necessary or desirable method of trial. This system, when first adopted, marked the abolition of grave abuses in the administration of justice by arbitrary power. But in a democratic government none of these abuses exist. The only instances in which juries now guarantee the rights of free men to a fair and impartial trial are those rare cases in which judges are exceptionally partisan, or are prejudiced on certain social questions. The real problem in our day is the practical one of deciding whether trial before a jury does or does not provide a swifter and more accurate method of administering justice than a trial before a judge. The jury trial is certainly expensive; and, moreover, the average citizen is not enthusiastic about serving on a jury.

The jury system is supposed to retain certain advantages which tend to ensure impartial justice. In the first place, it brings into the case the lay point of view, which is supposed to be less influenced by technicalities and likely, therefore, to be able to procure a quick and impartial decision. This supposed advantage is largely neutralized by the fact that the judge carefully instructs the jurors in the technicalities which

they are to observe. Indeed, the opinion is growing in some quarters that this ignorance of the jurors on legal matters is inimical to the achievement of justice; and it is even proposed that jurors should have such preliminary instruction as would give them the professional point of view. All this is only another way of saying that a judge could make a decision more intelligently and more expeditiously than a jury.

Another argument advanced in behalf of the jury system is, however, that jurors represent the same social class and the same point of view as the accused and should be able, therefore, to give his case a sympathetic hearing. This argument had considerable force under the social system existing when the jury was first instituted; but it has little weight in a democratic society with no organized class distinctions. Prejudices and jealousies may still exist between the rich and the poor, but jurors are seldom so selected as to avoid such prejudices. They are chosen rather with reference to their mental qualities and to their views concerning the immediate case and the possible penalty.

The delays due to trial by jury, and the opportunities it offers for sharp practices on the part of unscrupulous lawyers are all against the jury system. It seems anomalous also that, in these days of specialists, we should still put our trust in the judgment of the average man, instead of demanding an expert in a proceeding which is so highly technical as a modern trial. The trend at present is to resort less and less to jury trials, for it is believed that trial before a judge conduces to the more speedy administration of justice. Perhaps the jury trial should not be abolished altogether. It might still be optional in certain cases where prejudice exists. But it is probably destined to be used less and less commonly in the future, especially in cases of minor importance.

The powers of the judge. If judges are not to be permitted to hear cases themselves, then the question arises as to whether they should not be given greater power to direct the procedure. The gradual restriction of the power of the judge to that of presiding officer has not, it is claimed, resulted in facilitating justice. It is suggested that judges should be al-

lowed more freedom, both in restraining lawyers in irrelevant cross examination, and in questioning witnesses themselves to bring out the facts more clearly, in other words, that the judge rather than the lawyers should guide the course of the proceedings.

The system of appeals. Another abuse, which results both in delays and in the miscarriage of justice, is the system of appeals. Appeals to a higher court are supposed to be made on questions of law only, the decision of the jury with regard to the facts being accepted as final; but the appeal is too often made, not because of obvious misapplication of the law, nor on account of poor decisions which invalidate justice, but rather on minor technicalities with no real bearing on the outcome. When decisions of the lower court are set aside because of such minor errors as the omission of a word in the indictment, or failure to conform to exact legal phraseology, the act deserves nothing but ridicule. Appeals should at least be confined to cases where the errors that have been made involve a miscarriage of justice. Then appeals would be fewer and the work of the courts simplified.

But, if appeals based on technicalities should be restricted, the question then arises as to whether appeals based on matters of fact, or on other grounds where error might constitute an injustice, should not be made easier. The new English system permits appeals wherever an injustice appears, whether it is a matter of the law, or of the verdict, or even of the sentence imposed. Under this apparent extension of the possibilities of appeal, the numbers have not increased as it was feared they would. The restrictions proved to be greater than the extensions; and the courts of appeal are now able to transact their business more promptly than formerly.

The foregoing examples represent some, but by no means all, of the weaknesses of courts which might be improved by new rules of procedure. Other needed reforms would concern the duties and powers of the prosecuting attorney, particularly with regard to his power of arbitrary dismissal of cases; the power of the court to accept pleas of guilty to a minor offense in place of the original charge; the simplification

of the language used in indictments; and the simplification of procedure, so that decisions could be more promptly rendered. These and other proposed reforms in rules cannot be discussed in detail.

Reorganization of the courts. In addition to these suggestions for new court procedure, which are necessarily somewhat technical, mention should also be made of proposals for more efficient organization of the courts and increased coöperation among them. Decisions in American courts are delayed, not only because of a faulty system of procedure, but also because the average hours of their sessions are so short, and because the cases appearing before them are so numerous and varied in character. From time to time the number of judges is increased and new courts are established, yet no permanent relief from the pressure of business is obtained. It has been suggested that relief would better be sought in the organization of new types of specialized courts than through multiplication of courts of the same kind. This idea of specialization is already being worked out in some of the larger cities. For example, juvenile courts, or courts of domestic relations, are taking over certain kinds of cases; and they can adapt their machinery to particular needs and their judges and other officers can become experts in their lines. The aim is to have the cases dispatched more expeditiously, and at the same time to assure more rational decisions than would be possible in a court which had to try all kinds of cases.

Better coöperation among the courts would sometimes be attained, if those in each locality were organized under a single directing head. At present the courts are proud of their independence; but too much freedom results in friction over questions of jurisdiction. Efficiency of the courts might also be increased by a more intimate coöperation between the personnel of the various departments connected with the administration of justice, such as judges, prosecuting attorneys, and the police.

The personnel of the judiciary. We finally come to the all important question of the quality of the personnel connected with the administration. The efficient functioning of every

association is dependent of course upon its personnel, but especially is this true of the various departments of the government. Any institution will be administered acceptably by superior men, and will suffer from the selfish control of incompetent persons. But control of the courts of justice by dishonest or incompetent men has not only affected their efficiency but has resulted in modifying the organization and the rules of procedure in such a way as to weaken the whole court system.

In the United States, when city and state governments have come under the control of corrupt political rings, so also have the courts, and in all questions affecting their interests impartial justice has no longer been possible. Attempts by exasperated citizens to relieve unfair conditions began by circumscribing the powers of judges, in order that subservient appointees should have as little power as possible to further the interests of their masters. Reform was attempted first by adoption of a system of electing judges by popular vote, instead of permitting their appointment by interested political bosses. This precaution in itself, however, accomplished little, because the same machinery which secured the election of corrupt administrative officers also brought into office judges of the same type. Then the device was tried of shortening the term of office in the hope that, when the elections brought in subservient or dishonest judges, the evil results would be of only short duration; and the mistake might be corrected at the next election. This hope proved elusive, because one election proved to be similar to another; and individual reformers found themselves comparatively helpless in competition with organized political gangs. Even when independent voters tried to improve the situation by throwing an election to the other party, no permanent benefit was achieved, since both organizations were likely to be influenced by similar motives of greed. A combination of independent citizens sufficiently strong to defeat a political machine calls for competent organization and a long-continued struggle. Such combinations have sometimes been successful; but usually, after a brief period of rule, their interest lags, and control drifts back again

to the political machine which is always active and alert, since upon its strength depends the livelihood of its members.

This same fear of venality and incompetence was the cause of the adoption of some of the rules of procedure. If the judges could not be trusted, it was thought preferable to give more power to the lawyers employed by the parties concerned, or more power to jurors, for they at least were supposed to be honest and of average intelligence and so more reliable than unprincipled experts who could manipulate the procedure to the advantage of political bosses. It is to be noted, therefore, that the rules and restrictions concerning court officers and court proceedings presuppose inferior and untrustworthy judges. They were never intended for the guidance of honorable officials who possessed the confidence of the public.

Attempts at reform have been unfortunate in various ways. Not only have they failed to correct the evils at which they have been aimed, but they have so hampered the power of the judges that judgeships have become much less attractive to self-respecting and efficient lawyers; and it is very difficult to fill vacancies satisfactorily.

In the United States we seem to have tried every device imaginable to obtain a satisfactory administration of justice by altering the mechanism without changing the personnel, and we have met with little success. England has found the alternative method of concentrating upon the reform of the officials very satisfactory. They have succeeded in attracting competent men to office, and so have been able to endow them with wide power and authority. The position of judge carries with it social esteem, and this adds to its attractiveness. It is true that, in the United States, positions in our superior courts, both federal and state, are esteemed; but our inferior courts are considered very inferior indeed. Reform must go farther back than mere rules of procedure, for the evil to be eradicated takes its root in the political institution. When our political organization—especially the branch of the municipal government—is freed from the control of corrupt professional politicians, and when honest efficient men can be elected to office, the first step in judicial reform will have been taken.

Summary of basic reforms. A healthy political life is, then, the first prerequisite to efficient judicial administration; but, even if this fundamental improvement were attained, many minor problems of organization and policy would remain. Experience in this and other countries shows that, if good officials can be obtained, the interests of the public are furthered by entrusting them with considerable power and responsibility, rather than by circumscribing them in the exercise of their duties. But in order to secure good officials, the positions must be made attractive; and to accomplish this several reforms are needed. First, better salaries must be paid, especially in the inferior courts. Positions on the bench are important from the point of view of public welfare; but, in as much as they are generally despised by the higher grade lawyers, they are left to the unsuccessful or to the young and inexperienced. Secondly, the tenure of office should be longer. No successful lawyer wants to leave a lucrative practice for a judgeship which may last only two to four years. The bench should be a specialized occupation distinct from the bar. It should attract men with special abilities for that kind of work; and it should offer its successful judges permanent positions in their chosen line of work. In the interests of efficiency, judges whose work is of special merit should be rewarded with promotion, as such men would be in any other occupation.

Appointment or Election of Judges. The question of the relative merits of the two systems which have been employed in the selection of judges, election and appointment, is also an important one. The original reason for electing judges was, as has already been explained, an attempt to check a vicious political machine; and this point needs no further comment. But if we assume the existence of a healthy political life, and then compare the two systems solely on their intrinsic merits, the system of appointment would seem to have the advantage. For the method of election, accompanied as it is by the publicity and strife of a political campaign, is repellent to most persons possessing the qualities requisite for good judges; moreover they find in the brevity of the term of office an added deterrent. But many lawyers of ability, who would

refuse to enter a political contest, would accept a dignified appointment to a professional position, if it came as a reward of merit, and if the appointment were for life, or at least for a long term.

While the system of appointing judges, therefore, is almost certain to enlist a better grade of men than the system of election, and while this is a consideration of great importance to the bench, there is a real reason for using the system of election to political offices in general quite apart from the problem of obtaining worthy encumbents. Legislative and administrative officers are elected in order that they may reflect the wishes of the people and put their immediate policies into operation; and terms of office are short because conditions change and popular wishes may alter from time to time. Since a perfect elective system should reflect the sentiments of the people as directly and accurately as possible, it is fitting that legislators and executive officers who possess the power to initiate new policies should be elected. However, the fact should not be overlooked that officers appointed for short terms also represent indirectly the wishes of the people, if they are appointed to carry out policies for which the voters have shown preference. For example, cabinet officers are supposed to assist in carrying out the party platform, which has been endorsed directly by vote of the people; and they are appointed by the chief executive, rather than elected, in order to ensure harmony in a small executive committee.

The fundamental problem with regard to the selection of judges is then whether the work of these officers should reflect the changing sentiments and policies of the people, or whether their work is of a more permanent type, requiring specialized training and long experience. If the latter is the case, then election is theoretically unnecessary and practically undesirable. Furthermore, short terms of office are undesirable, provided some system of removal for just cause exists.

It seems obvious that the duties of judges are not of a type that should reflect changing popular sentiments, but that they gain rather by being safeguarded from interference due to the emotional moods of the people. The chief task of the courts

is to decide cases according to the law; and there is nothing in such work that would require judges to be in close touch with the sentiments of the people. If laws are unsatisfactory, relief should come from the legislature, which is in close touch with popular feeling, but not from the decisions of the judges.

A secondary and incidental duty of the courts is, however, to interpret laws; and, where inconsistencies are found, to decide which law shall have preference. This task does bear a close resemblance to that of legislation, because the interpretation of law, carrying with it important social or political results, may be of the utmost importance. Now is this task of interpretation sufficiently important to warrant the election of judges, that they may make their decisions in accordance with the wishes of the people? Any method of interpretation according to popular will would be confusing and unworkable. If judges tried to curry favor in their interpretation of laws, two rival law-making departments would spring up, the legislature and the courts, both trying to conform to public opinion. Interpretation of laws is not supposed to be made in accordance with the changing sentiments of the people, but, rather, to be based upon existing laws with due consideration for former legal interpretations and for traditions. If the interpretations are unpalatable, the resort should be to the legislature to make the law clearer or more specific.

It is of course desirable that judges should not be so wrapped up in the traditions of the past as to be out of harmony with the spirit of the times, for legal interpretations must have regard for existing conditions. To be representative of one's age and generation, however, is entirely different from being responsive to current whims and passions, and is not a quality inconsistent with the appointment of judges, nor with long terms of office.

For the efficient performance of judicial tasks, then, technical training and experience are needed, rather than responsiveness to popular opinions. On the whole the judiciary would gain by being removed from the sphere of political controversies, and by being protected from popular interference.

Furthermore, long term appointment of judges would be preferable to election for short terms, for the greater permanency would enlist better men into the service, and would also contribute to the efficiency of their work. Our experience with judges of the Supreme Court would seem to bear out these contentions. The system of life appointment does probably tend to make the courts conservative bodies; but, so long as they are not too reactionary, this quality should not be considered undesirable.

Conclusion. The courts, it should be remembered, are a part of our governmental system and are bound to show a character not unlike the rest of it. To expect to find an honest and efficient system of justice as an outgrowth of a selfish and venal political machine would be unreasonable. As long as the government itself is corrupt, there can be no hope of a permanent remedy for the ills of the courts; and, under such circumstances, perhaps the best system available for the selection of judges would be election for short terms of office.

When, however, the governmental organization is honest and capable, the problem of the judiciary is entirely different. A system may then be formulated with the single idea of promoting efficiency in the administration of justice; and it seems probable that the system of appointment for long terms of service will attract more able men, and will at the same time favor the impartial administration of justice.

Assured of a body of judges both able and trustworthy, the rules of procedure could be altered to give them greater power; and this ought to result in a further gain in efficiency. In short, as soon as we can have confidence in our judges, we can begin to utilize them. Other reforms in the organization of the courts and in the method of appeal would naturally follow, which would contribute to the unity and efficiency of the whole judicial system, and free it from the domination of absurd technicalities. Such reforms ought to proceed from within the legal profession; but, if action from this source is long delayed or inadequate, radical reforms will certainly be forced from without by direct action of the people.

The notorious ineffectiveness of our judicial system is no

doubt traceable partly to the natural conservatism of the judiciary, which is trained to follow precedent and is repelled by new and direct methods of procedure. But reform here has been impeded by the apathy of a certain type of lawyer more interested in fees than in the pursuit of justice. Such men extract their living out of the very tangle of rules and technicalities; and any fundamental change in procedure would require them to learn anew that manipulation of forces which they are happy to call the practice of law. The more reputable members of the legal profession have also been at fault in not taking the lead and forcing reforms. Scorning the field of criminal law, and avoiding all dishonorable practices, they have been satisfied with the position of superior critics instead of becoming active agents in reorganization.

From the foregoing analysis, it is evident that effective reform of the whole system of justice can never be achieved merely by making changes within its special sphere. The judiciary is merely one member of the great organization of the state, and improvement in one member can be achieved only when there is health in the larger body. But the administration of justice depends, not only upon its obvious relation to the body politic, but also on economic conditions. It can never be entirely impartial, nor free from suspicion of favoritism, until the economic organization is improved and the distribution of wealth is more equitable. Equality before the law and democracy in the state, both wait for the attainment of greater democracy in economic life.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Enumerate all the agencies which have anything to do with law and order in your community. What others exist in the state?
2. Do you consider the police efficient in your city? If not, what is wrong?
3. Do the police receive any training for their positions? Are they required to pass any kind of an examination? What is their pay?

4. Attend a session of the local court and describe the proceedings. Do you consider that justice is dispensed there?
5. What are the chief causes of delay in trials in this country?
6. Should the same penalties always be imposed upon different individuals for the same offense?
7. Are judges appointed or elected in your state? Do you think that another system would give better results?
8. What do you consider to be the chief defects of the courts?
9. Are the lawyers in your city organized? Are they interested in the improvement of criminal law and procedure?
10. Visit the county jail, and make a report on conditions.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

BATES, F. G., and FIELD, O. P., *State Government,* Chapter 14.
BEARD, C. A., *American Government and Politics,* Chapter 29.
KIMBALL, EVERETT, *State and Municipal Government in the United States,* Chapters 14, 15 and 27.
MUNRO, WILLIAM B., *The Government of the United States,* Chapter 34.
OGG, F. A., and RAY, P. O., *Introduction to American Government,* Chapter 40.
PARSONS, PHILIP A., *Crime and the Criminal,* Chapters 12 and 13.
SUTHERLAND, EDWIN H., *Criminology,* Chapters 9 and 12.
WRIGHT, JOSEPH, *Selected Readings in Municipal Problems,* Chapters 31, 32 and 33.

CHAPTER X

THE SCHOOL

The Importance of the School. In any democratic country the school is one of the most important institutions, for it provides the education without which the people as a whole would be unable to direct intelligently their own affairs. Where general education is lacking, a nation inevitably either falls under the sway of some powerful group within its own bounds, or under the domination of a foreign power; and in either case the citizens lose their power of self-determination. The schools have, therefore, been correctly called the bulwark of popular liberty. But in addition to the task of preserving political freedom, education, in developing the individual, changes the whole character of civilization and opens the way for the perfecting of the social organization, so that happiness and well-being may be the common possession of all.

The Purposes of Education. The effect of general education upon the social order is so great that the nature of education must be considered briefly, as a preliminary to an estimate of the work accomplished by the schools, though the purpose of this chapter is to discuss the school as a social institution and not to analyze the philosophy and content of education itself. From a broad point of view, education is the process of adapting the crude material embodied in the child to social needs. It involves both personal development and adaptation to social environment.

If we adopted the root meaning of the word education, we should conclude that it was merely a method of drawing out qualities already inherent in the individual; but this would give us a one-sided conception of the process, for education includes putting in as well as drawing out. These two phases must always be present to supplement each other. Neither

could be maintained by itself. The individual is not merely a well which, if opened up, will give forth water indefinitely. He is more like a machine which has to be fed continually to create the finished product. Still better, perhaps, the individual is like a seed germinating in the soil, which must be carefully nourished and tended before it can develop its latent qualities and bear fruit. And, just as the care of the plant includes several specific processes, so the work of developing the individual calls for many separate measures which must be taken into account, if the efficiency of the school is to be justly estimated.

The socialization of the individual. The first task of education, that of socializing the individual, calls for measures of training or discipline which shall curb his original self-centered tendencies and teach him due consideration for the rights and interests of the other members of the group with whom he must live; that is, education provides first the discipline needed to enable individuals to adapt themselves to one another, so that their life in common may be smooth and harmonious. Adaptation, however, does not consist merely in the acquisition of certain traits of character, such as self-control and consideration for others, though these qualities form the preliminary basis for it. Individual qualities have to be supplemented by the acquisition of numerous habits of action, called social customs or conventions, which have grown up in response to a desire to make our social contacts easy and agreeable. Rules of etiquette sometimes seem complicated and useless, and they are of course less important than the spirit of good will they are intended to express; but they furnish, nevertheless, necessary means of facilitating our social relations. Even though we possess the basic social quality of good will to others, we must still have some uniform method of expressing that spirit, or our attempts to be courteous may be confusing and misunderstood. Careful observance of these amenities of life is said to be a sign of good breeding, that is, it indicates a careful education in the art of social adaptation. The advantage of such training is sufficiently evident in the greater attractiveness of the person of refinement compared to one

with uncouth manners. Individuals in modern society do not merely live, they have to live in close contact with others, so acquaintance with the best methods of getting along with others is an important part of their education. To ignore social conventions as superfluous, or as unimportant accomplishments, is a mistake.

The acquisition of knowledge. The second purpose of education is the acquisition of knowledge, and this is ordinarily regarded as its chief purpose. But perhaps the relative value of this aspect of education tends to be overestimated. Society has accumulated an enormous number of facts and theories which it has arranged in systematic order, and the educated person is supposed to have partaken of this knowledge; but it is quite impossible for a human mind to absorb any large proportion of this material, and the average person who only goes through the lower schools, hardly makes a beginning.

Fortunately knowledge may be classified for different purposes and for different types of mind. Some of it is of a simple nature and very practical in its application, such as the rules of languages by which ideas are communicated, the beginning of mathematics, those simpler principles of the sciences which make the physical environment comprehensible, and such accounts of past events and of our present social organization as ensures an intelligent insight into present-day social life. Knowledge such as this is considered essential to the welfare of all; and its acquisition forms a minimum standard of education. The next group comprises an extensive field of knowledge, including literature, art, and some of the sciences, which does not appear to be of such immediate practical importance, but which enlarges the mental horizon and multiplies human interests. So stimulating and broadening are these subjects that some acquaintance with them is considered essential to a liberal education, though this is not generally acquired by the mass of the people. Finally, there is a third field of knowledge which is of advantage chiefly to specialists and to those who are themselves making original contributions to human knowledge. This includes the more advanced work in the sciences, which can be undertaken only after special

training, and is useful chiefly to scholars carrying on special work in particular subjects. Such knowledge is used by specialists, no one of whom attempts to cover details in more than one or possibly two fields.

These various fields of knowledge are mentioned chiefly to show that education for the average person is not intended to provide for the acquisition of knowledge in general, but merely knowledge of an elementary type. Since education is primarily, as has been said, a process of socializing the individual, and as even the acquisition of knowledge is partly for the purpose of assisting in the larger process of socialization, the knowledge needed first is the kind that will help individuals to become more useful members of their social group. The process of selecting for this purpose a few subjects out of the extensive range of human knowledge naturally gives rise to one of the most difficult problems of education.

The development of the faculties. A third purpose of education is to develop the innate qualities of the individual. The child is a composite of faculties, or of possibilities, some of which should be repressed or modified, while others should be fully developed. The process of selecting human traits for development is an important part of the task of education. If an individual is to be a useful member of society, his antisocial traits must be suppressed; and if he is to be an active and efficient leader in society, his special abilities must be encouraged to the utmost. This phase of the work of education —the making the most of individual talent—is closely connected with the other two phases, and is partly, though not wholly, achieved through them. The adaptation of the individual to society and the absorption of knowledge by him necessarily tend to develop his faculties. But the supposition that the faculties are sufficiently developed in the mere process of learning is one of the errors of our educational system. The mere acquisition of knowledge does strengthen the memory, and possibly it makes keener the powers of observation; but it does not of itself sufficiently develop the analytical and reasoning faculties. Schools should use special methods to stimulate these valuable faculties, instead of regarding their

development as a normal by-product of the general discipline of education.

Schools Share the Work of Education with Other Institutions. These three aims of educational work, the socializing of the individual, provision of the means for the acquisition of knowledge, and the training of the faculties, offer a very broad program; but it should be pointed out that this work is not confined to the schools alone, but is shared by other institutions. The education of the child begins in the family, is assisted more or less by other organizations, and is constantly stimulated by all his personal activities and associations. The schools take over the more formal part of the educational program, while the work of other institutions is much more incidental. The home, however, is of great practical importance in educational work, because its influence over the child in early years is continuous and almost exclusive. The school should be regarded, therefore, as the special institution for continuing and supplementing the work of the family. The two are closely interrelated and interdependent, both in their purposes and their methods.

While the schools are concerned with all three of the phases of education outlined above, their work is organized with special reference to the last two functions, instruction and the development of the faculties. The first function, the task of socialization, is by common consent performed largely by the family, because socializing influences have to be brought to bear at the very beginning of the educational period. Although none of the schools ignore this process, any conscious effort towards socialization is confined chiefly to the lower grades. In the higher grades this process goes on rather more through unconscious imitation and example than through formal instruction and correction.

The Educational Policy of the Schools. With this explanation of the nature and purpose of education, we may next inquire into the policy of the schools themselves. Although the schools were obviously organized to carry out the work of education, such a general statement does not enlighten us concerning the actual duties which the schools should assume.

How much education should the schools provide? Should they educate all equally? At present there is nothing like a policy of equality in general education. Many children receive only a minimum amount, and they would often be denied this by irresponsible parents, if the law did not intervene to require it. On the other hand, many are so eager for educational advantages that they go through a full university course, and some even add professional training, largely at state expense. Are the schools fulfilling their duty to the community in general so long as such differences exist? Before answering these questions an explanation of the reasons for the inequalities will be essential.

Limitations upon the Educational Work of the Schools. These variations are due to two causes: first, to differences in wealth and in other circumstances which make it impossible for some to attend school over a long period; and, secondly, to differences in desire for educational advantages.

Lack of financial resources. The sacrifice of an education simply because of lack of means is always regrettable, and society should overcome financial disabilities as rapidly as possible. Many communities are already doing their utmost to make education available even for the poorest classes. Not only are the schools free from tuition charges, but text books are provided free of charge, and even lunches are given at only a nominal cost. Still, in cases of great poverty, these measures obviate the difficulty only in part, because the needs of the poor are so great that mere relief from expense is not enough. So many families actually depend upon the income of their children's labor, that large numbers of children drop out of school for work as soon as the law permits.

When, however, children can manage to stay through the preparatory grades, a higher education at their own expense is more feasible, both because then they have a greater earning capacity, and because their hours of instruction can be arranged to suit their needs. Facilities for students to earn their way through college are moderately good; and those with sufficient energy and determination can overcome economic barriers, serious as they are, provided they are not encum-

bered by dependents. When others are dependent upon their labors, a higher education is rarely possible.

It is clear that utilization of the schools beyond the legal requirement is dependent partly upon economic conditions, and only the more equal distribution of wealth can open the doors of opportunity to all. If knowledge is the immediate key to freedom, economic independence is in turn the prerequisite to the acquisition of knowledge.

Lack of the desire for education. The variation in the patronage of the schools which is due to differences in individual desires and abilities presents an entirely different problem, for these are traceable to inborn differences, or to very early influences which affect ideals. If either the desire for an education, or the mental ability to attain it, is definitely lacking, usually education should not be forced. To try to educate the individual beyond his abilities is evidently a waste, and to press higher education upon those who do not wish it would be unprofitable to them and would complicate the work of the schools by retarding the progress of the more serious students.

Any widespread opposition to education on the part of the mentally competent would be unnatural, but sporadic attacks on educational institutions are to be expected and may be ignored. An appreciation of education should be cultivated in every democratic community, and wherever the sentiment towards education is favorable, voluntary attendance in the higher institutions will probably bring the students best fitted to profit by it. Occasionally, it is true, young people, because of misconceptions or warped ideals, forego a higher education which they would later find valuable; but even then the situation, though regrettable, should not be changed by force, for educational opportunities will be profitably used by those of a more mature age only when the desire is strong. Remedy for mistaken ideals has to come slowly through the action of public sentiment.

This discussion brings us to a more definite conclusion concerning the task of the schools. It is desirable that they should furnish elementary education for all young children; but they

should provide advanced education only for those who desire it and are capable of receiving it. When many are opposed to education the attitude is abnormal and should be corrected, but by the action of public opinion rather than by force. In as much as it is unnatural, however, for anyone to oppose education if he can profit by it, it may be said that the ideal school system is one which offers to every individual an opportunity to develop to the fullest extent the faculties which he possesses. Those with the greatest native ability should have the most education; and those with less should receive less education. The application of this principle of education according to talent would necessitate the elimination of all economic disabilities to the acquisition of learning, and would presuppose a general sentiment in favor of the acquisition of an education whenever possible.

Characteristics of School Associations. Before proceeding to a discussion of the defects of the schools and remedies for them, the character of the school organization should be noted, for it throws light both on their defects and on possible methods of reform.

Schools are small associations. Schools should be placed in the class of small associations. This is evidently true of the small unit where the work is actually carried on in the class room. And even the larger administrative organization of the school or the college is ordinarily confined to the size in which the advantages of personal contact may be retained. It is true that the school unit is growing in size, and some of our largest universities might be regarded as having passed beyond the limits of the small association where general personal acquaintance is possible. But even here the work of instruction is carried on in small primary groups; and the larger organization should be looked upon as a possible overgrowth of the small association, rather than an example of a large association.

The recent increase in the size of educational institutions, and the accompanying growth in the unit of instruction, have given rise to new problems and have had a tendency to make the instruction less thorough. As a general pedagogical prin-

ciple, instruction can be efficiently given only in a small group where personal contacts are intimate and individual influence is strong. As the units become larger, attention to personal problems becomes of course less possible, and instruction cannot be individualized. The younger the pupils are, the more essential it is to keep the group small, so that individual needs may be considered. But as pupils advance, they can be put upon their own resources to a greater extent, and depend upon the teacher chiefly for suggestion or for general guidance. The prevalence of large classes in the more advanced schools, therefore, is not entirely incompatible with sound principles of education, though the increase in the size of universities, which conditions them, certainly has not improved educational efficiency.

In those periods when students sought a higher education for intellectual stimulus, the universities which possessed the most eminent scholars and the most inspiring teachers were centers of attraction for advanced students; and the method of instruction of lecturing to large audiences was adopted through necessity. It probably never was considered an ideal system of instruction. In more recent years, since a university degree is often sought for social or financial reasons, all educational institutions of accepted standing, whether they are inspirational centers or not, have increased in size. In the more advanced schools, therefore, as well as in the lower grades, much of the value inherent in personal instruction has been lost through numbers; and the large universities have not yet regained their former efficiency through the introduction of new methods of instruction.

Schools are primary associations. A second characteristic of school associations is that they are almost always of the primary type, that is, all the members of the group come into personal contact with one another. The advantages of this type of association are so obvious that it seems the only one suited to schools. In it teachers can become intimately acquainted with their pupils, and can come to appreciate their difficulties and their needs, so that they can adapt the work of instruction to those needs and give individual assistance and

encouragement. The pupils, on the other hand, can profit by contact with the personality of the teacher, and can as well have the opportunity of making known their individual difficulties. Fellow pupils also are stimulated by contacts with one another; and each may learn both from the failures and from the accomplishments of the others.

The only schools which do not belong to the primary type of associations are the so-called correspondence schools. Their method of instruction is of course necessarily limited to advanced pupils who are capable of working independently; but even under the most favorable circumstances these students are deprived of much that is valuable in instruction, because of the lack of personal contacts. It is certain that the ordinary and approved method of carrying on educational work will continue to be in the primary group.

Schools are decentralized. Another important characteristic of schools relates to their organization rather than to the form of association. In the United States they belong to that class of loosely organized associations whose jurisdiction is limited to small areas. Although the unit of the school district varies in different parts of the country, it is uniformly small, because the intention is to confine it to an area which may be personally supervised by one official. In practice each school is left largely to its own resources; and its success is dependent in great measure upon the character and initiative of its own head, not to say upon the work of every individual teacher. A certain amount of supervision is exercised over schools by the state, and even by the Federal Government; but this is of a general nature and does not seek to consolidate the whole system into an administrative unit. Private schools and colleges are entirely self-contained.

Such independence is a characteristic of American ideals of decentralization and of individualism; but it has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. The great advantage is that it permits the various schools to adapt themselves to the particular needs of their communities; but it carries with it the disadvantage of imposing upon the small local community all the expense of its educational requirements. The system

is considered a progressive one, because it enables schools to make their own experiments and try out new methods. Whether progressive or not, it does tend to self-reliance and avoidance of criticism, for no district can blame another district or a central body for its own deficiencies. This small district system probably tends also to simplicity of organization and to ease of administration. The irritations and delays incident to officialism and bureaucracy are largely avoided.

On the financial side, however, the justice of such complete independence of small school units is beginning to be questioned. While the system of allowing each district to pay for its own educational requirements seems reasonable, yet, if the districts are too small, it results in inferior schools in the less prosperous districts, simply because they cannot afford better ones. The whole state, therefore, suffers through the defective education of some of its citizens. So it is often contended that the money for the schools should come from a larger area, perhaps from the state as a whole, and that it should be distributed in such a way as to ensure better school facilities in poorer sections. If, however, the state distributed the funds for the schools, it would probably demand some control over them; and financial centralization would lead to administrative centralization.

While decentralization of administration is generally preferred in this country, it has disadvantages. Freedom to make experiments results in great diversity of standards. Education comes to be a different thing in different places, and there is no uniformity in the value of school diplomas or of college degrees. While the absence of central control may permit certain institutions to forge ahead, it allows others to lag far behind reasonable standards.

So far as the colleges are concerned, however, the individuality which they develop under the stimulus of autonomy is on the whole more desirable than objectionable. They do institute new and successful methods; they do develop a progressive spirit; and, although in general they cover the same ground of higher education, they have the chance to specialize in particular lines. This differentiation in their curricula per-

mits students a considerable range of choice, since colleges are open to all, and they are able to select an institution in conformity with their needs and ideals. This introduces an element of individuality in higher institutions, which is coming to be a rare quality in education as it is in other phases of social life.

Public and private schools compared. Another problem of importance to schools is connected with the source of authority. What are the relative merits of private and of public schools? Should schools be directed by religious denominations, or should they be independent of church influence? In the United States the common school education, having been generally recognized as essential for everyone, was early undertaken by the public. Higher education, on the other hand, was left to private initiative; and, in as much as colleges were primarily for the purpose of training clergymen, they were usually established by religious denominations. It was only after higher education was demanded extensively by persons preparing for other occupations that university training was furnished generally at public expense. Along with the growth of state universities, the private institutions began to give up their religious affiliations. Private institutions of higher learning, therefore, since they are generally older and since they developed their traditions earlier, cannot easily be compared with state universities purely on grounds of achievement. No conclusion can be drawn with regard to their relative efficiency, because this depends so greatly upon their respective resources, the particular character of their officers, and the members of their teaching force. Only certain specific advantages of one or the other system may be pointed out.

On the whole private universities seem to have the advantage of being more independent than state universities. Institutions receiving money from the state are subject to criticism and interference from ignorant and prejudiced citizens. Now universities, like other institutions, should be directed by experts; and private universities seem to be able to put their affairs into the hands of experts with less interference from outside sources than do state universities. This independence

may sometimes have resulted in the loss of donations from narrow-minded givers; but it is evident that such losses have been more than made up from more liberal sources, in as much as endowments to private institutions have in general steadily increased.

On the other hand, private institutions, being free, are free to become more narrow and prejudiced than public institutions. They may even be established for the express purpose of teaching particular beliefs or creeds, or for the purpose of barring certain subjects from their curricula. Such intentions may seem at the time to be in the interests of truth and freedom; but, if any set of restrictions persists, these almost always become fetters, eventually hindering growth and preventing true community service. Private schools, therefore, show greater range of variations than public schools; and, consequently, they are sometimes thought to adapt themselves more promptly to the needs of the public, and sometimes they are accused of lending themselves too easily to public prejudices and ephemeral beliefs. The estimate will depend largely upon the point of view; perhaps both opinions are correct.

Private institutions have the advantage of more freedom to restrict and select the numbers of their students than do public institutions. Schools supported by public funds are supposed to be available to all who wish to attend them, the only restriction upon candidates being a reasonable degree of fitness to undertake the work. The result is that the new problem of undue size has been confined largely to state universities. Private universities, not being under the same financial obligation to the public, have made use of the opportunity to select from among their applicants a limited number of the most promising type. If private institutions can permanently attract students of a higher average quality, they may be expected to do more effective work than state institutions.

A point in favor of all public schools is that they are less expensive than private schools; and this is one of the factors operating in selection by pupils. Private schools of the lower grades usually have to charge enough tuition to cover their

expenses; and this acts as a selective force, limiting students to those who can afford the cost. This tends to bring about a more homogeneous group, because the student body is confined to those who have had similar home and cultural advantages. Whether this is a gain or not is open to argument. Some prefer the broadening influence to be found in a school with a wider representation of the various classes in society.

Institutions of higher learning are in a different situation. Although state universities are somewhat less expensive than private universities, the difference is not so great as it is in the lower schools. One reason for this is that the public does not yet support its higher institutions of learning so adequately as it does its grade schools, and therefore a part of the expense still has to be borne by students. The other reason is that education is so highly esteemed in this country that private universities have been able to secure moderately ample endowment funds, so that students in private universities are not required to bear more than a small proportion of the total expense of their education. Even so, the difference still seems formidable to those who must practice rigid economy. Therefore the greater expense of private institutions does act as a moderate selective force, favoring those with adequate means. The selective force is not great enough, however, to affect materially the natural heterogeneity of a large student body.

It must be concluded, then, that both private and public schools have their special fields; and both are useful enough to be retained as a part of the educational system, though public schools seem to be becoming the more popular as their efficiency increases. There is no reason why the efficiency of public schools should not be equal to that of private institutions so far as equipment is concerned, provided they are properly supported. The public must come to realize that in the long run schools really are institutions which amply repay a generous support. The extra burden which the public schools are liable to have to bear, and which may affect their efficiency, is the task of caring for a larger proportion of students who are below the average of intelligence.

The whole public school system, including the higher in-

stitutions, to be efficient and to retain the confidence of the public, must be kept free from political influence and domination. It would indeed be unfortunate if education were perverted to the individual or private advantage of those in control of the government. Also, it would be a menace to the cause of education if the schools were used to teach party or class doctrines. But the schools of the United States have so far been remarkably free from political influences. The people have by a sort of instinct jealously guarded the educational system from outside contamination. Occasional suspicious instances of political or corporate control have so disturbed public sentiment as to indicate that they were exceptional rather than representative cases.

The Schools and the Work of Socialization. Having reviewed the purposes of the schools and noted their particular type of organization, we may turn next to the vital question of their efficiency, remembering always that the different grades should not be judged on the same basis, since they are expected to concentrate on different phases of educational work.

First, if we consider them from the point of view of their efficiency in promoting social adaptation, that is, their success in directing and controlling crude instincts and in teaching the social amenities, we must admit that the schools are comparatively unsuccessful in their mission. But perhaps the schools are not entirely to blame for this failure because after all they are not really the chief agents for such training, their influence being subsidiary to that of the family and other outside social relations. Where families have already started the disciplinary training of their children, the schools are often able to continue it acceptably. But, if families have been lax in their control, and if outside associations of a child have been unwholesome, the schools are usually incapable of accomplishing adequate social adjustments by themselves. They may be able to force a measure of control sufficient for their own purposes of order and instruction, but their training is not likely to be effective enough for the permanent requirements of social life. In a day school the nature of the control over

the child is too general and impersonal, and too frequently interrupted, to stand competition with the influences of the home and the street. The badly trained child may, to be sure, unconsciously absorb something from mere observation and association with those better trained; but, on the other hand, those of superior training run some risk of becoming demoralized by the habits and manners of their inferiors. In large schools there is a tendency for all grades to approach an average.

To avoid this danger many exclusive private schools have been organized for the patronage of the cultivated classes, in order that the effect of home training may not be lost. But, from the social point of view, a more desirable measure would be the establishment of exclusive boarding schools for the undisciplined, that they might be removed, not from other children, but from the influences of their own home surroundings. If schools had the entire control over their charges, they ought to be more effective in their efforts at socialization.

This form of educational work brings out most clearly the close dependence of the school upon the home. Schools are hampered by defective homes, because children coming from them are defective both in home discipline and in home instruction. Education is not a process which can begin afresh at school age. It has to carry on from what has previously been accomplished, whether that has been good or bad. The quality of the original material has to be taken into account, and the result judged on the basis of relative improvement. So it would be unjust to give the schools all the credit, or all the blame, for the characteristics of their pupils when they are ready to leave.

The Schools and the Work of Instruction. The second function of the schools, that of teaching the various branches of knowledge, seems to be performed best of all; and this is to be expected, for the schools themselves regard this task as their chief function, and they direct their whole organization towards its accomplishment. Teachers with specialized training are employed, systems of instruction are studied and tested with the object of improving technique, and, moreover,

prospective teachers are frequently required to undergo special training in methods of instruction. Finally, the whole school system of a particular district is placed under the supervision of experts, that the highest possible grade of efficiency may be maintained. So the perfection of the organization, the labor and devotion of the teachers, would all point to a successful result. It would indeed be unjust to insinuate that the schools were not successful in this their chief undertaking. Children attend the schools up to the age of fourteen, or even eighteen; and, during these years, they receive a certain amount of mental discipline and assimilate a greater or smaller proportion of the material which they are offered. All this constitutes an achievement so great that it fully justifies the money and the labor expended.

Yet, after giving to the schools all deserving praise for what they have achieved, there is a feeling prevalent that they are not accomplishing all they should. The experts whose task it is to direct the course of education are the first to realize and admit the shortcomings. Their dissatisfaction is indicated by the desperate attempts now being made to comprehend reasons for the defects, and to institute improvements in methods.

It should be said at the outset that, however unfortunate the defects of the school system may be, they are not so serious and discouraging as are those of some of the other social institutions, for they are not traceable to the selfishness or venality of those engaged, nor are they due to the corruption of officials, nor to their subservience to outside interests. The charge of corruption is, to be sure, sometimes made; but instances of it are so scattered and infrequent that corruption cannot in general be held accountable for school deficiencies. Reform, therefore, is not a question of cleansing the organization of evils, but rather of a more intelligent comprehension of educational needs, and of instituting better methods of procedure. The desire for improvement exists both within and without the organization.

The defects of the schools are due to various causes. A part of them can be traced to inadequate financial support, and these could easily be remedied; but others are more technical,

and their correction would necessitate a reform in educational methods.

Deficiencies due to lack of funds. Most schools are hampered by physical deficiencies which, from the point of view of educational discussion, may be of minor importance, but which should be noted nevertheless as one cause of their imperfections. Poor equipment and poor teaching are usually the result of inadequate financial support. The work of educating everyone in the community to the extent of his abilities is a costly process, yet only a few communities have fully realized this. The attitude towards education on the part of the vast majority savors too much of the frontier, where there is little division of labor, and where, therefore, specialized training is not needed.

Paucity of financial support is usually most obvious in lack of suitable schoolhouses. The buildings are not well adapted to their purposes, the rooms are likely to be poorly lighted and ventilated, overcrowding is common, and the equipment is inadequate. Of course these criticisms do not apply to those advanced communities where new buildings, excellently adapted to all the various needs of the pupils, stand as monuments to the value which they place on education. Notwithstanding these notable achievements in school construction, however, material deficiences are still the rule rather than the exception; and they are serious, for they affect the health and comfort of the pupils and interfere also with efficiency of instruction.

Another result of insufficient support is the inferior quality of the teachers. While the most advanced districts are beginning to impose high standards in selecting their teachers, other districts are not financially able to do so; and consequently many teachers are still employed, especially in the rural districts, who have had only an inferior education themselves, and have little comprehension of effective methods of teaching. This situation is attributable only in part, however, to low salaries, because the rapid growth of population has increased the demand for teachers more rapidly than the training schools have been able to supply them. In addition, many

who enter the teaching profession regard it as only a temporary makeshift instead of a permanent vocation. This is unfortunate, because constant changes in the teaching force must interfere with the attainment of a high standard of instruction, since temporary teachers are not likely to be well trained, nor are they likely to take their work so seriously as those who make teaching a permanent occupation. These defects due to insufficient support are fairly apparent and need not be discussed in detail. They will be remedied gradually as the public comes to appreciate more generally the importance of education and the necessity for well-equipped schools.

The difficulties of teaching large numbers. Faults of instruction are much more difficult both to analyze and to remedy than material deficiences, because we have to take into account general theories of education and practical methods of applying them. As it is, the schools offer instruction, and at the same time the pupils fail to obtain an education. That the failure is partly due to the inexperience and inferior quality of the teaching force we have already seen; but it is partly due also to the unsatisfactory methods that must be employed in dealing with large groups.

The rapid growth of population in our democracy, where everyone has the right to an education, has increased the numbers of the pupils beyond the capacity of the schools to handle them. While this situation, in the lower grades at least, can be relieved by better financial support and the provision of more buildings and more teachers, in the higher institutions the troublesome problem of instruction in large groups still remains. It is not difficult to teach one person; and the excellent education which certain notable men, such as Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill, obtained by personal instruction with little formal school discipline would seem to suggest that effectiveness in teaching increases as the number of pupils decreases. Anyway, where the ratio of pupils to teachers increases beyond a certain point, teaching not only becomes more difficult, but it requires the introduction of new methods; and it must be admitted that we have not yet found a satisfactory method of teaching large groups efficiently. One solution

suggested advocates a return to the small group with a great multiplication in the army of teachers; but such a solution seems impracticable, both because of the expense involved and the difficulty of obtaining enough competent teachers. As the situation now stands, in this intermediate stage of adjustment, the schools are still struggling with a difficult problem, and the pupils are being deprived of those valuable educational influences which come from intimate personal contact.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What in your opinion are the qualities which an individual should acquire through education?
2. What benefits did you gain from your high school course?
3. What benefits which should be obtained in a school did you fail to receive? What were the reasons?
4. Compare your college course thus far with your high school course, from the point of view of educational advantages.
5. Did your high school have sufficient room for the number of pupils? Did it have sufficient equipment for the work?
6. Why do not more high school students go to college? Is the reason lack of inclination or lack of funds?
7. What are the defects of "correspondence schools"?
8. What do you think are the relative advantages of public and private schools?
9. Discuss the benefits pupils derive from instruction in small classes as compared with large classes.
10. Should a State Superintendent have more power to unify the school system, or is local autonomy better?

For additional readings, see end of Chapter XI.

CHAPTER XI

THE SCHOOL (*Continued*)

The Curriculum. Closely connected with the increase in attendance at advanced schools, is the problem of dealing with the enormous increase in the number of subjects taught. The situation is partly the outcome of a controversy which has been going on over educational ideals, and from which have arisen new theories of education which are gaining recognition. The attempt to put these theories into practice has caused an expansion in the curriculum, which has strained the resources of the high schools and colleges to the utmost.

Determination of the curriculum involves two important phases. The first has to do with the character of the entire group of subjects to be taught, that is, the general direction which education shall take; and the second is concerned with selection, from within the general group, of specific subjects which will prove most valuable. The former phase involves the underlying purpose of education; and the second concerns the means best suited to achieve that purpose.

Determination of the general course of study. This first problem of the curriculum, involving as it does the whole theory of what education seeks to accomplish, is beyond the scope of this discussion; but a brief explanation of the difference that exists in educational ideals will be worth while here for the light it will throw on the difficulties which are at present confronting our educational institutions. Two schools of thought are represented. On the one side, the older school believes that education should be a cultural discipline, broadening the mental horizon and assisting in the acquisition and appreciation of the best mental products of all times. On the other side, the newer school maintains that education is a means, not an end in itself, and that students should receive

the training which will fit them to deal with the practical affairs of life. They agree that education should discipline and develop the mental faculties; but they believe that these ends may be accomplished just as well by one set of subjects as another. Their standard of judgment is always the practical utility of the subject taught.

Contrary to the general opinion, both parties do believe that education should fit people for life; their disagreement arises over the kind of life which the educational system should have in view. The so-called educational reformers, in concentrating on the practical ends of education, have, according to the disciples of the cultural ideal, overemphasized the material advantages to be gained. For they advocate "practical" subjects, which will fit people for particular occupations—which, in brief, will make them successful economically and professionally. Among the specific courses which they think the schools should offer are those which teach students to cook food properly, to care for children, to acquire a trade, to accumulate wealth, and to understand and perform the duties of citizenship. Other kinds of subjects may, they admit, possess value, though their pursuit is likely to be a waste of time when the number of practical subjects is so large and the need for an acquaintance with them is so pressing.

The advocates of culture, on the other hand, maintain that our material activities comprise only one phase of life, that they are, indeed, only the necessary preliminary to those mental and cultural activities which make up the real life of human beings and differentiate them from animals. Mental acquisitions, they contend, are means, not ends; and an educational system which concentrates on those alone commits the grave error of dealing only with the preliminaries of living and of omitting to teach the ways of life itself. The primary duty of education in their opinion is to train the individual to healthy mental activity and to prepare him for intellectual enjoyments. What could be more practical, they ask, than those subjects which introduce the student to a broader and more satisfactory mode of life? In fact, the kind of teaching which enriches life becomes more and more practical as peo-

ple gradually come into the possession of a greater amount of leisure for enjoyment. The introduction of labor-saving devices, and other improvements in production, have increased wealth and with it the possibilities of leisure; and this is an indication of social progress. But such progress would prove to be a mere husk if it were not accompanied by increased mental resources. Certainly, then, educational institutions would be disloyal to their ideal of fitting people for life, if they failed to provide for the increased time and leisure which the individual now possesses and which he may devote to the higher processes of living.

If an appreciable difference actually exists between these two points of view concerning the true purpose of education, it would appear that the advocates of culture had much the broader comprehension of life, and that the logic of the situation was entirely on their side. But their position has been somewhat weakened by the fact that they have allowed themselves to be drawn away from a discussion of the general principles and purposes of education to a controversy over the advantages of one specific subject, namely, the classics. They have permitted the principle of cultural education to become identified with the narrow field of classical studies, when these form only one of the many subjects which satisfy cultural requirements. They could have yielded ground in the narrower field without abandoning the principles of a cultural education.

From another point of view also the cultural school has made itself appear conservative, because it has failed to take into account those new conditions confronting educational institutions, which are due to the great increase in numbers of students. While this increase in itself is an encouraging feature in national life in so far as it represents a more general desire for the advantages of a higher education, yet at the same time the recent accession represents classes hitherto unaccustomed to cultural ideals, and they are making unaccustomed demands. They belong to those classes which look upon a school as a place where they may receive occupational training, and on a university, since it is an advanced school,

as a place where they may obtain training for more specialized occupations. Parents, therefore, spurred on by ambition for improving the social position of their children, send them to universities to become engineers, or lawyers, or more efficient business men; but they wish no time or money wasted on the frivolities of education. They desire thoroughly practical courses of study, by which they mean the selection of money-making subjects.

It must be admitted that the educational reformers have sensed this situation first, and, confronted with these new conditions, they have been right in maintaining that new courses of study must be organized to satisfy the demands of those who now constitute the majority of the student body. Even though the new curricula turn educational institutions into occupational schools, apparently even our universities must resign themselves to becoming higher trade schools, as well as centers of culture. The readjustment is difficult, and sometimes it brings confusion, for the demand has been met in the advanced schools by multiplying courses and departments, instead of by merely substituting new courses for old. This multiplication has not only necessitated enlarged faculties, but it has necessarily brought in a new type of teacher with different ideals and methods, and has gradually altered the whole spirit of advanced study. Yet the new situation need not necessarily involve an entire change in educational ideals. It may mean merely that advanced educational institutions, in assuming new duties, are now providing both technical and cultural training.

It is indeed desirable that schools should satisfy the legitimate demands of all classes in so far as their resources permit them to do their work well. The danger is that, in the general stampede for training which shall prove lucrative, educational institutions may abandon their old ideals of a cultural education and devote their energies too exclusively to technical or occupational studies. Education in the sense of a preparation for a broader intellectual life is not, and never will be, superfluous in a healthy society. The sudden popularity of the new technical courses of study may have temporarily over-

shadowed the cultural branches; but the latter are bound to recover their lost position, though relatively of course they will not regain their former predominance.

Specific subjects of study. The other phase of the problem of the curriculum has to do with the specific courses which may best carry out accepted educational ideals. After the general purpose of a course of study is determined, specific subjects have to be selected with due regard for their probable utility, and also with regard to the practical feasibility of teaching them. In cultural schools the standards for selection doubtless differ somewhat from those in technical schools, but both have many problems in common. In technical and business schools the danger lurks in a tendency to select only those subjects which are obviously practical. Since such schools train for particular occupations, their tendency is to discard all subjects which do not have a direct occupational bearing. Yet, in any line of work, an alert mind and a broad viewpoint are valuable assets for advancement; and courses which train the mind in rapid and logical thinking, and those which deal with broad underlying principles, should therefore not be despised.

In selecting courses for the curriculum in cultural schools, the important question is not whether a course is actually educative or not, for most of them would be that; but whether the choice may not be influenced too much by habit and precedent. Because a subject always has been taught as a basic cultural course is no guarantee that it always should be. Old and time-honored subjects will continually have to make room for new subjects as they prove their worth.

Of course this problem of selecting specific subjects for any educational curriculum is a technical one for school authorities, and cannot be discussed in detail here. It is mentioned to show that it is quite a different problem from that of determining the general aim of an educational system, though the two are often confused.

The sequence of subjects. A subordinate phase of the problem of choosing specific subjects for a curriculum is the question of attaining a suitable sequence of subjects from grade

to grade. Successful gradation of subjects to meet the needs of different ages depends not only upon choice of subject matter but also upon methods of presentation. Those subjects which are considered essential for everyone must, of course, always be given in the lower grades, and they must be presented in simple terms. In the higher grades cultural subjects and the less complicated technical subjects may be taught; and the method of instruction should be modified with the purpose in view of developing the reasoning faculties. Although this procedure would seem to be the obvious one, it it not always found in practice.

A better coördination of subjects as a whole, as well as a more logical sequence of subjects from grade to grade, should also be sought. At present there is too much repetition of the same subjects in different grades, especially in the curricula of high schools and colleges. Students who continue their studies through a college course waste much time in repeating the same branches in a more advanced form. For example, study of the sciences is begun in high school, and afterwards in college it is continued in courses adapted to beginners. The high school instruction may make the succeeding college course somewhat easier, but it is not thorough enough to enable the student to enter directly upon advanced work. Time would be gained and instruction would be more effective, if high schools offered fewer subjects and taught them more thoroughly, so that students would be fitted to enter advanced courses immediately without having to repeat elementary work.

There are several reasons for this duplication. One is that, as the majority of high school pupils do not go to college, the high schools organize their courses primarily for the benefit of the larger number who will not continue their education. The situation would be improved if cities would specialize their high schools, making some of them college preparatory schools and others finishing schools.

Another reason for the multiplication of subjects in high schools and repetition in colleges is that the teachers who have received college training are prone to repeat in high schools

the courses they have taken in college, instead of organizing new courses with special reference to the needs of high school students. Because of this imitative tendency, courses are gradually creeping into the high schools which are really suitable for the curricula of more advanced institutions only.

In the last analysis, these faults are due to the decentralized character of the school organization, and to the absence of coöperation between independent schools of different grades. An expert educational director who had authority over all grades of schools might possibly achieve a greater simplicity in the curricula of schools, and arrange a better sequence of studies from lower to higher grades; but, under the present organization, each school has full authority over the arrangement of its curriculum, and each teacher has considerable freedom in determining the character of the specific courses taught.

Methods of Instruction are Ineffective. So far, the discussion of the educational problems of modern schools has been concerned with the numbers to be taught and with the subjects to be chosen for instruction. Another problem, and perhaps the most important one, pertains to the method of instruction itself.

The general trend of popular complaints against the schools is that pupils fail to get the education they should have during the period of school attendance. This fact cannot be denied, but in too many cases its cause is traceable directly to the neglect or incompetence of the students themselves. The subject under discussion here, however, is the schools, not the character of the pupils; and we have, therefore, to consider to what extent defective education is attributable to inadequate methods of instruction.

That the schools are held partly responsible is evident by the many new experiments in methods of teaching which are continually being tried out, and the various attempts that are made to improve the training of teachers. This training is supposed to include courses in methods of instruction; and doubtless courses in pedagogy do embrace valuable principles and give excellent information concerning the best methods of imparting knowledge. But, for the most part, the training

merely offers prospective teachers an opportunity of acquiring some preliminary practice under supervision, before they undertake an independent position. Actually, of course, success in teaching is largely the result of natural aptitude. After making due allowance for the scarcity of excellent teaching ability, the conclusion is unavoidable that the system generally in vogue is defective in that it fails to take sufficient account of the natural process of learning. Its failures will be discussed under the headings which follow.

Too many subjects are taught. One fundamental weakness in our plan of instruction is that it is made too comprehensive. We crowd the student with too many subjects and with too much material in each subject to permit complete absorption. A thorough understanding of one great principle is much more valuable than a hasty survey of half a dozen. Human knowledge is vast, and we try to force as much of it as possible into the minds of pupils, apparently as a method of utilizing it. Educators must learn that acquisition of knowledge is for the purpose of mental development, not to preserve it from waste.

Too much mental food defeats its own purpose. The student not only fails to develop, but he seems to lose all natural desire for the acquisition of knowledge. Its heavy pressure makes learning no longer a pleasure but an irksome task; and the subjects studied, instead of being gradually absorbed and appreciated, have to be hastily memorized in order that school requirements may be fulfilled. It would be much better for the pupils if they should study a few subjects thoroughly during their school years, and in the process acquire a keen interest in learning that would stay with them through later years. Too many students regard the school training as a thing to be endured, or passed over quickly, instead of looking at it as a mere preliminary to a continuous period of mental activity and development.

The interest of the pupils is not aroused. Another way in which school instruction departs from the natural process of learning is that the interest of the pupil is not sufficiently aroused in the subject before he is required to study it. In the normal course of development, children show a curiosity

with regard to new things, which is followed by questions or attempts at investigation. This method of learning is effective because it follows their own mental processes. If formal school instruction fails to take into account this need of preliminary attention, the solutions of problems have little meaning and are not remembered. A subject is studied because it is in the next lesson, not because the pupil has discovered it for himself, therefore the material is likely to be learned by rote instead of being absorbed in response to an inward demand.

Of course the kind of instruction which ensures this natural process of learning presents a real difficulty in practice and cannot be pressed too far. The time element involved in school instruction requires that courses should be taught systematically each day. The teacher cannot wait for each pupil to propound his own particular problem before leading him on, nor can the teacher spend his time in answering random questions on any subject which may enter the minds of the pupils. Nevertheless improvement could be effected by giving more attention to the approach to a new subject; its significance could be brought to the attention of the pupil in a way to arouse his interest beforehand, so that he would turn to it with pleasure and concentrate on it intelligently.

The process of learning is too passive. Another defect in our educational methods is that the student is allowed to play too passive a rôle. While this fault is partly the result of our lack of appreciation of the natural method of acquiring knowledge, it is due also to insufficiency of equipment for the size of classes. A student learns more effectively, of course, through his own experimentation than by watching demonstrations by another, or by memorizing the results of the investigations of others. But, while this principle is thoroughly well recognized, it has not yet been widely applied in practice. In kindergartens, to be sure, the education of children is usually promoted through stimulating their own activities; and some of our higher institutions of learning are beginning to provide sufficiently adequate laboratory equipment so that the sciences may be taught by the natural method. But it is usually

impossible to put all the students at work, either in gathering material or in solving problems. In schools of all grades the teacher still does the work of investigation for the pupil in most of the subjects taught. He looks up the material available, he organizes it and presents it, while the pupil sits passively by, obliged to acquire his education by committing to memory the results of another's efforts.

So education has been restricted altogether too much to developing the one faculty of memory; and even the work of memorizing is frequently done under conditions which reduce its own value to the minimum. For too often the learning is either done under compulsion, which makes education an irksome task instead of a pleasure; or it is done without sufficient interest in the problem in hand, which makes the information presented both meaningless and unfruitful.

But the passive method assumes also a relationship between pupil and teacher which is wrong. The teacher, instead of being regarded as a guide in the quest for knowledge, is looked upon as an infallible source of information. So the student, seeing no reason why he should waste time and effort in laboriously searching out information for himself, assumes a passive rôle and becomes mentally submissive. Actually, however, the teacher, while he is usually a person of intellectual interests, possesses only a limited amount of knowledge; and his pupils should be made aware of the fact that his function is that of a leader or co-worker. Regarded in this light, he should be able to stimulate the student to active and independent mental effort.

While the foregoing explanations may account for defects in methods, they do not of course offer specific remedies. Success in changing methods of teaching, so that the student shall play a more active part in acquiring knowledge, will necessarily depend upon general conditions in a school, upon the equipment available, and upon possibilities for initiative on the part of the student in the particular subjects taught. Without entering into any detailed analysis of helpful methods, it will be sufficient here to suggest that exercises, such as debates or discussions of principle, reports on special topics from library

sources, personal investigation of conditions in the environment, all give the student an active rôle and are far preferable to exercises in memorizing material from lectures or the pages of a book.

Subjects studied show little practical bearing. Too often in all grades of educational institutions the subjects studied bear little relationship to the actual affairs of life. Pupils necessarily gather information chiefly from their teachers or from books, and not from situations and conditions actually observed; and later in life, when occasions arise where the information they have been given might be really applicable, they too often find themselves unable to recall it. This failure is likely to be attributed to poor memory, and assumed to be inevitable; but one reason why they forget so easily is that they did not have in the beginning any link of connection between the information and the situation to which it applied. The natural system of memorizing is through the association of ideas. Care should be taken to make the association a natural one. For example, children should learn the multiplication table, not by rote, but by actually using the figures in multiplying; that is, the figures themselves should be made the cues by which the rules are recalled.

This simple principle of instruction is often ignored, even in the higher grades. Many a student can give, for example, a graphic account of some geological formation, if only he can once get started; but the sight of the formation itself is not, as it should be, the source of suggestion. His description is more likely to be connected with a particular page of his text book. Naturally unless the facts in a text book are in some way made vivid, the process of memorizing is of little educational value.

The application of this well-known principle of the association of ideas has its practical difficulties too, for the pupil is of course unable to come into actual contact with, and examine personally, all the things he studies. There are ways, however, of making them real to him. For example, if a pupil is studying the process of law-making, and cannot visit Congress, he may be shown pictures of the capitol and perhaps

even of the legislative bodies in session. He may, at least, be given a vivid description of legislatures, so that they will mean something definite to him while he is studying their methods. Or, again, if a student is studying the organization of a corporation, he should learn to connect the information at hand with some particular corporation with which he may be acquainted, so that he will avoid associating the material merely with the pages of a book. Only by this method of direct association will the student find his knowledge of much practical value, since only by such means can he attach the facts to the object itself, and therefore make it easy to recall them when needed.

Subjects are not well coördinated. Another educational defect of a similar nature is that we fail to associate or coördinate different kinds of knowledge. We retain them as unrelated units rather than as parts of a united whole. As William James remarked, we keep information of different kinds in separate water-tight compartments of our brains. Our information, derived from a variety of sources, exists as a mosaic instead of being welded into a homogeneous unit. If we could associate and harmonize what we learn, it would increase its value enormously. Sometimes such association is all that is comprised in the work of the inventor.

The immediate result of this lack of coördination is that different branches of knowledge fail to assist or supplement each other. It is a common thing to find pupils who can spell, for example, when reciting their spelling lessons, but who cannot spell when writing a history report. Or, a student who is able to write correct English for his English instructors, when his attention is concentrated on expression, lapses at once into the vernacular of the home or the street, when speaking to his less formidable athletic director.

The ultimate result of this lack of coördination is that we fail to achieve a logical, consistent outlook on life, and tend to retain ideas and theories quite incompatible with one another. Few people have what is called a general philosophy of life, built up from their knowledge as a whole, and adjustable to newly acquired ideas. They are likely to retain some

special set of beliefs, derived from early teaching, which they cling to tenaciously, quite undisturbed by the fact that they are entirely inconsistent with other views which they have later accepted. A common example is the incompatibility of the religious and scientific beliefs which people so often hold. Less commonly, inconsistent theories obtained from the different sciences are innocently retained.

While the fusion of knowledge into a workable unit increases its value, such harmony can be realized only by active thought and unsparing self-criticism. It is impossible for a teacher to achieve this unity for the pupil. It must be accomplished chiefly by the student himself, as he develops broader and more discriminating habits of thought.

The Influence of the Schools on Individual Development. The foregoing discussion concerning the efficiency of the schools has been confined largely to the work of instruction, because this is supposed to be their chief duty; but before leaving the subject their task should be considered in relation to the third purpose of education, namely, the training of the special aptitudes, or, as it is sometimes called, the development of individuality. This work is important because its aim is to make the most of the talents of each individual so that society may profit to the utmost from the special talents of all.

The extent to which the schools are successful in this endeavor is a matter of opinion. To demonstrate their actual achievements is impossible, because special aptitudes are bound to develop more or less in the ordinary course of a pupil's activities. The severer critics maintain that the general effect of school methods is to repress individuality and to turn out a uniform product, because the students are all subjected to the same sort of training and discipline. This view, however, is certainly extreme, because, though it is true that some of the school practices may tend to repress individuality, others actively develop it.

The greatest obstacle to the development of special aptitudes is the excessive size of classes. This creates a situation which necessitates uniform methods and exercises; and, since

students subjected to the same discipline are likely to develop similar habits of thought and points of view, they do have the appearance of being suppressed rather than stimulated by their school work. It is impossible, however, for teachers who have to supervise large classes to become acquainted with the particular talents of every individual student and develop each through special exercises. A student trained under a special tutor is much more likely to develop strong individual characteristics, though he may not receive such thorough training in all subjects.

Not all school work, however, tends to uniformity, especially in the more advanced institutions. The system of permitting the student a wide choice of subjects is one school regulation which tends to develop individuality. It permits students ordinarily to select the departments and the specific subjects which they prefer, and this should mean those suited to their capabilities. Thus the elective system of courses is utilitarian in that it permits the individual student to pursue those subjects he will find useful; and it is educational in that it stimulates the development of individual talent. The system is sometimes criticized as one-sided and narrowing, because the student tends to confine himself to courses of the same type, and this limitation prevents a well-rounded development. But the student would find little advantage in pursuing studies intended to develop faculties which he lacked, compared to the gain of concentrating upon those which would develop his special aptitudes to the utmost.

Another educational method favorable to individual development is to be found in the use of all those exercises and requirements which put the student upon his own resources by demanding individual effort. Such requirements may be few, or they may be numerous, depending upon the institution and the individual teacher; but special investigations and reports are now quite commonly required, and they could advantageously be made a larger part of the school discipline.

Finally, it should be noted that personal direction of the work of students, and personal supervision of choice of subjects, are still given by instructors even in the largest universi-

ties, though such aid cannot be so effective where students are numerous, and the time and energy of the instructors is largely consumed in routine work, as it is in small institutions.

The conclusion to be drawn is that, though training for the development of individual traits is difficult under our present school system, it is far from being ignored. Any neglect, in so far as it is attributable to the schools, arises more often from insufficient equipment than from intentional oversight. But in many cases its failure is not attributable to the schools at all, but is the result of the attitude of students themselves towards their education. In the last analysis a student's education depends upon his own efforts; and those who seek it may find in the present school equipment both the facilities and the personal attention requisite to develop special aptitudes.

The School Must be Rated as a Relatively Efficient Institution. The criticisms of the schools given here may seem numerous, though they do not by any means exhaust the list, and one might conclude that the schools were inefficient and demanded thorough-going reforms. Such an inference would be incorrect. Compared with other institutions the school organization should be classed as well-managed and efficient. Schools are neither decadent nor stagnant. In general, the larger schools are in the hands of specialists whose sole object is effective service; and improvements are constantly being inaugurated to realize this end. One reason for the variety of the criticisms is that the standards for judging the schools are relatively higher than those for most of the other institutions. The subject of education has come to be a very live one. Investigations are being conducted, and new methods of teaching are constantly being proposed, in the endeavor to obtain better results. It is, then, their struggle for improvement, rather than any inefficiency they may exhibit, that has given rise to the searching criticisms.

Another point to be kept in mind, in attempting to make a just estimate of the accomplishments of the schools, is that they themselves are not wholly responsible for the results obtained. In the first place, they are not responsible for the raw

material presented; and frequently this is of a character to discourage the most ardent educator and make any school system seem ineffective. Secondly, the schools are not isolated and independent organizations, but they have to work in conjunction with other institutions in a state of interdependence; therefore deficiencies in other institutions must necessarily interfere with the success of the schools, no matter how efficient their organization may be. The close connection between the family and the schools has already been mentioned; but the work of the schools is also bound up with that of recreational and cultural associations. On the administrative side also it is connected with the political organizations. Finally, the support and development of school work is dependent upon the people themselves, not only through their governmental associations, but also through the success of their economic enterprises. Thus the school system is merely one of a number of interrelated organizations, and its work must be judged on that basis.

The reforms already inaugurated in the schools have in general improved the methods of instruction; and increased financial support has permitted an expansion in material equipment, and has gradually raised the standards of the teaching force. In addition to the improvements achieved in the work of the schools themselves, the situation is further favored by the generally high character of school superintendents and members of educational boards. These are usually men of excellent ability, and they have often had special training and experience, so that their policies are broad and progressive, having in view community interests rather than selfish aggrandizement. Finally, the schools enjoy the advantage of being left comparatively, though not wholly, free to pursue their own ends without undue interference from political or other selfish interests. The record of the schools for impartial and unselfish service has earned for them the confidence of the public, so that it has wisely left them to the direction of experts in their own field.

The Schools Are Enlarging Their Activities. The schools are gradually assuming a position of greater importance

than ever before in the life of the community; and the public seems to rely upon them more and more for various kinds of social work. In Protestant countries, at least, they appear to have gained somewhat at the expense of the church. For certain kinds of social work, they are becoming more favored agents than the church, which formerly was without question the accepted organization for social amelioration. The public is coming to look favorably upon private educational institutions as worthy objects for endowments, which in former times were commonly left to the church. Whether these endowments will ever present a serious social problem, as have the properties of the church, is an open question. They would seem less likely to become a menace, because educational institutions are entirely independent of one another and the various endowments they receive are not directed by a single individual or corporation.

In large cities the outside activities of the schools are very varied, though they may not be of great relative importance. Even in rural districts the schools often take the lead in many kinds of social service, usually through the initiative of the teachers. Schools coöperate with the health authorities in the important task of attending to the physical needs of the pupils. Physical examinations, conducted under the supervision of the schools, enable the health officers to correct physical defects, and to detect the presence of contagious diseases at their first appearance so that they are kept from spreading. The schools also coöperate to some extent with the juvenile courts and with the police in handling moral delinquents. Indirectly, through charitable agencies also, they carry on social work in some of the homes.

The most extensive work not strictly educational undertaken by the schools is, however, social and recreational. Social events for both young and old are held in school buildings, and are often arranged and led by teachers, in those communities which possess no social centers. A moderate amount of recreational work may normally be considered a part of the regular duties of any school; but in many districts the efforts are pushed far beyond the bounds of the absolute require-

ments of school work. The schools have become the natural centers for athletic contests and for the promotion of interest in sports. Expert instructors are engaged to train the pupils in games and to prepare them for formal athletic contests.

In addition to athletic sports, other recreational activities of a more definitely educational value are also sponsored by the school. These include musical entertainments, community singing, dramatic representations, and even sometimes elaborate pageants of definite historical significance.

In the educational field itself, also, many schools carry on a much broader work than that of merely instructing regular pupils in classes. Lecture courses are frequently organized by school authorities and given in school buildings. Educational moving picture films are presented. Lyceums, debates, and spelling matches are conducted, especially in rural districts.

Many of these activities undertaken by the schools are purely voluntary, led by teachers who are already over-worked, and who could not be considered negligent in their duties if they made no effort to promote them at all. The explanation is that many communities have few social organizations or social centers; and the schools are being utilized to perform the services which in former times came within the province of the family, or possibly of the church. Now the school, that organization which brings all the children of a community together anyway, has become the natural center for influencing and directing their social activities. Moreover, through the children, the families themselves may be reached and influenced. Schools engaging in these diversified pursuits naturally seek teachers who have a broad community viewpoint and are willing to become community leaders.

The real problem connected with these outside activities of the school is not concerned with the character of the work accomplished, for this is unquestionably useful. It is rather a question of the advisability of utilizing the schools, instead of other organizations, for carrying on such work. On the whole teachers are, it is true, well equipped to undertake these extra duties; but the danger is that their teaching efficiency may be impaired by a diffusion of their interests and their

energies over too wide a field. As communities become richer and more populous, new and diversified associations should be formed to specialize and concentrate on particular lines of work. These specialized organizations may reasonably be expected to relieve the schools of many of the extra activities they have had to initiate. The real difficulty in many communities is, however, that there is a scarcity of competent leaders, and the presence of new organizations will not relieve the teachers if they still have to serve as leaders.

Conclusion. This discussion of the problems of the schools has shown that their defects, while numerous, are not fundamental. Schools belong to the type of institutions which requires progressive reforms rather than any radical reorganization. Educational defects are largely traceable to two sources. In the first place, our methods of instruction have become artificial and ineffective, because we have failed to understand the normal development of the human mind and the natural process of acquiring knowledge. With the progress of the science of psychology, and the application of its principles to education, methods of instruction will gradually become more scientific. In the second place, the comparatively rapid growth of both schools and classes from small to large units has interfered with the improvement to be anticipated in educational methods, by introducing new problems which the schools have been unprepared to meet. Too often the larger number of students has had to be served by the old equipment and the old methods. So far, the problem of mass teaching has hardly been solved at all. Indeed, there is reason to believe that instruction in large groups is inevitably inconsistent with the natural process of learning; and the new difficulties can be overcome only by throwing more responsibility upon the student and less upon the teacher. In the present stage of development, the assumption of responsibility by the pupil is largely a voluntary matter; and those who fail to assume it receive a faulty education, because no system of compulsory exercises has been found to replace the voluntary efforts of the students themselves. At present, some of our higher institutions are conducting experiments with the object of restoring

the personal element to instruction. If the methods prove effective and not too costly, they will overcome a serious defect in our school system.

In addition to internal reforms in methods of instruction, a school system, to be thoroughly effective, would have to be assisted by reforms in certain related institutions; and of these the one which could be of the greatest immediate service is the state. In as much as few schools have the financial means to carry on effectively all the work demanded of them, better support, either from taxation or from private funds, would be an essential aid to their success.

Another step in advance could be made by the abolition of all outside interference with or control over educational work. This does not mean that educational institutions should not be supervised by experts, nor their work regulated and coördinated by properly selected officials; but it does mean that the oversight should be exercised by experts and not by persons with selfish interests to serve, nor by other social institutions. In the past, instances of control by the uneducated have tended to check progress and hamper educational development.

Better coöperation between the family and the schools is also essential. If families should do their part in the early training and discipline of their children, the burden of the schools would be greatly lightened. Moreover the task of education continues to be so closely connected with the family that coöperation between teachers and parents, at least during the early school years, can be of great assistance in the development of the child.

Finally, the establishment of outside specialized institutions, such as recreational and social organizations, will help to lighten the burden of overworked teachers and permit them to concentrate their attention more fully upon the difficult work of instruction.

The schools deserve all our efforts at improvement, for efficient schools will not only furnish better-trained individuals, but they will assist materially in the task of improving other social organizations, and therefore contribute in a twofold way to the welfare of society as a whole.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Are you repeating subjects in college which you have already studied in high school? To what extent did the high school course assist you?
2. Make a list of the subjects you have studied in high school, or in college, in order of the benefits you have derived from them.
3. Compare the relative educational advantages of lectures, assigned readings, class room discussions, and reports on special topics.
4. Discuss the educational advantages of the study of Latin and Greek.
5. Do you think that school methods tend to interfere with the development of individuality?
6. What improvements would you suggest in the school system?
7. How much money is usually raised for schools in your school district? What proportion is this of the total taxes?
8. Do you think that too large an amount relatively is spent on education?
9. Should school teachers be the organizers of recreational activities? Of social activities?
10. To what extent does "politics" affect the school system of your state?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

BEACH, WALTER S., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapter 28.

COUNTS, GEORGE S., "Education" in *Recent Social Changes,* W. F. Ogburn, Editor.

ELDRIDGE, S., and CLARK, C. DEW., *Major Problems of Democracy,* Chapter 17.

JENKS, JEREMIAH W., *Citizenship and the Schools,* Chapters 1 and 2.

JONES, ARTHUR J., *Education and the Individual.*

KIMBALL, EVERETT, *State and Municipal Government in the United States,* Chapter 29.

KIRKPATRICK, W. H., *Education for a Changing Civilization.*

MUNRO, WILLIAM B., *Principles and Methods of Municipal Administration,* Chapter 9.

CHAPTER XII

RECREATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Significance of Recreation. Although associations for recreational purposes may seem to form a small and unimportant part of our social life, they are actually an indispensable factor to a complete and well-organized group. The exact nature of this contribution will become evident as the character and purpose of recreation are understood. In its broadest sense the subject of recreation is very comprehensive, for properly it includes the use of leisure time, although in most discussions the subject is narrowed down to those activities which are entered into for the immediate enjoyment they give. Even in this narrower sense the subject is sufficiently comprehensive. In this chapter the discussion will be limited to this narrower range of activities, but these will be considered always with reference to kindred activities and to the entire social life of the individual.

Recreation has been defined broadly as refreshment of body or mind. A comprehensive definition of recreation is difficult to formulate, because several distinct functions are involved which are specifically designated by such terms as play, amusement, or diversion. But these should be regarded as subdivisions, or specific forms, of recreation, rather than as something distinct from recreation. In as much then as formal definitions tend to emphasize one or another of the functions of recreation, a description of its various purposes will be more useful at this point.

The Purposes of Recreation. Recreation is first of all what the term implies, a re-creation or restoration of energies of the body or the mind. This function of recreation is closely akin to that of rest; but rest is a wholly passive form of recuperation, while recreation is a more or less active method of

restoring the energies. The desire for recreation usually implies that there still remains some energy to be used, provided it is expended in a pleasurable way. Recreation for recuperation normally follows the labor of the day; and the needed recuperation may be gained either in the use of other faculties than those employed in work, or possibly in the use of the same faculties in a different way.

Recuperation is by no means the only object sought in recreation. Animals and children play before they are tired, not afterwards. With them it is not a means of recovery, but is rather a normal method of expending surplus energy. Their play, moreover, is not a superfluous or wasteful expenditure of time; it is a natural method of developing the faculties and of expressing individuality. Here the function of play is more closely allied to education than to rest. To combine play and recreation in the same class may seem inconsistent with the function of recreation as given above; but it is not really a case of including inconsistent things in the same classification. It is rather an example of using similar activities for quite different purposes. Adults resort to recreation to restore their energies, while the young use play as a method of expending energy. Both uses have their place. Those serious-minded persons who frown at play, and who feel that the energy expended in it is wasted and ought instead to be devoted to some practical end, overlook the educational function of play. To expend energy in interesting and even exciting ways is the best method of development; and it is the only method possible for the very young, whose faculties are still crude and undisciplined. Few people at any age, however, are so fully disciplined as to be beyond the lure of recreational activities in one form or another. In fact social progress will tend to make all activities, including even our most arduous forms of work, more interesting and pleasurable, and less matters of mere drudgery.

A third function of recreation, which is closely connected with the preceding, is that it aids in developing social instincts and furthers the process of social adaptation. Recreation in most of its forms is taken in groups, and hence it satisfies so-

cial as well as individual needs. Competitive games accomplish even more than this; they develop coöperation and team work, and so repress excessive manifestations of individualism, thus providing the discipline essential to a harmonious social life. They also instill into the individual a sense of fair play and of good sportsmanship; and they train him to accept defeats as well as victories with equanimity, and to show consideration for worthy rivals.

While these three results comprise the immediate influences of recreation upon the individual, other indirect effects of systematic recreation are of great social importance. In the case of an adult, a regular recreational period keeps him more alert. It gives him an interest in an outside activity, which is pleasant in itself, and this interest helps to relieve life of some of its drabness and monotony. A state of society where adults were so engrossed in hard labor as to have no time or energy left to devote to recreational interests would be abnormal. Young people are in still greater need of recreation than adults, because of their surplus energy which must be consumed in one way or another. With suitable facilities available, this energy may not only be used in ways which are harmless, but in ways which positively promote development. If recreational opportunities are lacking and children are allowed to run wild, they will inevitably engage in mischief, which may later lead to serious consequences. The opening up of play grounds in cities and the organization of play groups, have been followed by a marked decrease in juvenile delinquency.

Recreation Distinguished from Other Activities. The three chief functions of recreation given above may be classified under the three heads of recuperation, individual development, and social adaptation; and one or another of these results is to be found also in other pursuits. Consequently, it may be well to distinguish recreation more carefully from some other kinds of activities.

Our daily labor, for example, may supply the last two of these characteristics, individual development and social adaptation, to a high degree; but usually it stands in strong contrast to recreation in so far as recuperation is concerned. Labor

may be defined as the expenditure of time or energy for an economic reward; while recreation is the expenditure of time or energy for the pleasures and benefits immediately derived from it. Work is regarded as arduous and exhausting, while recreation is agreeable and recuperative. Actually, however, the disagreeable aspect of work, though commonly present, is not a necessary accompaniment of all labor. Some kinds of labor, if well adapted to individual abilities, are pleasurable forms of activity, though they may seem arduous because they follow a particular schedule and are often continued for too long a period without change. Work and recreation, therefore, are borderline activities and sometimes merge into each other.

Recreation should also be distinguished from social intercourse which it so often accompanies. By social intercourse is meant the companionship or intellectual relationship between individuals. Social life is frequently combined with recreational activities, and many people find a considerable amount of recreation in social contacts. So social intercourse might seem to be a subdivision of recreation in its broadest sense; but, in as much as the recreational side of social relationships does not embrace all the qualities of recreation, it is preferable to distinguish the two and make social intercourse a distinct phase of the life of the individual.

For practical purposes, it is more important to distinguish recreation from the pernicious set of activities known as dissipation. Recreation and dissipation are in theory the exact opposite of each other; the one restores the energies, and the other wastes or dissipates them. But in practice the two are closely connected; indeed, they are sometimes almost indistinguishable. Many dissipations contain some of the qualities of recreation, and all recreations, if carried to an excess, become dissipations. The difference does not depend so much upon the nature of the activity concerned as upon its ultimate effect upon the individual. The question is whether the activity tends to restore the powers of the individual and render him more energetic and capable, or whether it tends to sap his energies and weaken his working powers.

In as much as people differ greatly, both in their dispositions and in their occupations and modes of life, they naturally find recuperation in different ways. So an activity which furnishes recreation for one might prove to be a dissipation for another, and no accurate distinction can be made on the basis of the activity itself. For this reason moralists have made a mistake in classifying acts as desirable or undesirable merely from the nature of the act itself, without taking into account these differences in individuality. However, this point need not be pressed too far, for after all individuals do bear a strong resemblance to one another in their dispositions and in their needs, and are similarly affected by work or play, though they do show varying degrees of susceptibility. There are activities which cannot be arbitrarily classified either as recreations or as dissipations, but there are others which are unmistakably dissipations in their ultimate effects.

The Problems of Recreation. Turning next to the problems connected with recreation itself, we must take account of the variations in need for recreation growing out of differences not only in age but also in disposition and mode of life. To satisfy these dissimilar needs, there is fortunately available a great variety of games and other forms of recreation. But the real problem is not merely to provide everyone with an opportunity for recreation, but to suit forms to individual needs. For its solution an analysis of the particular characteristics of the various kinds of recreation available is requisite, and an estimate of the needs of the several classes of individuals to be served.

Characteristics of the different kinds of recreations. Although no attempt will be made to give a complete classification of recreations, the chief characteristics of the different kinds must be reviewed in order to show their relative desirability for different needs. The most important distinction that can be made is between active and passive forms of recreation. Active forms are best illustrated by games or sports, while passive forms are represented in attendance at theatrical performances or in witnessing sports or other spectacles. Both

these forms have their places in a recreational program, but naturally they are used for quite different purposes.

Other distinctions apply chiefly to the active forms of recreation. Among these the important division is between mental and physical types of recreation. Although an absolute separation on this basis is impossible, the general difference implied is self-evident. Certain mental games, like cards and chess, require no physical exertion whatever; and many games, and certain physical recreations, like climbing or swimming, require no mental activity; while competitive sports usually demand the active coöperation of the physical and mental faculties.

In the task of selecting suitable recreations for all classes of the population, account should be taken also of the amount of exertion which a game involves. Furthermore, indoor games should receive consideration as well as outdoor games, for they are of special importance in cold climates; and games which may be played in the evening by artificial light are also important, especially in satisfying the needs of the adult population.

In addition to these simple and fairly obvious classifications, which are useful for a recreational director, games may advantageously be graded according to their degree of complexity. Certain games possess much greater possibilities for scientific play than others. These, demanding as they do the exercise of a greater number of the faculties, are both more entertaining and mentally more stimulating. For example, swimming, though an excellent exercise and a desirable form of recreation, lacks the essential element of a game, competition. It is an individual performance, as are gymnastic exercises. It should, to be sure, be ranked above calisthenics because it is more interesting and more healthful; but it should be ranked below a game like golf, for the latter is more than an exercise. Golf involves a definite objective which may be accomplished with varying degrees of skill, and much study and practice are needed for proficiency in it. It is also competitive in the sense that the skill of one person may be measured against the skill of another; but it lacks the very valuable element of contest or combat. The competition lies

merely in ascertaining which player can do a particular thing best; and such competition may enter into any activity. There is no conflict of wits or of skill for the purpose of outmaneuvering an opponent, or defeating him in the proper sense of the term.

The true combative element appears at its best in such games as tennis, baseball, and football. Here the superior playing of one side serves to counteract or frustrate the efforts of the other side. This factor is the highest quality which enters into a game, and is the element which makes the leading sports so fascinating both to players and to spectators. Tennis, for example, has practically all the desirable qualities of a superior game and should be ranked in the highest class, even above golf. It may be played by two persons only, which is sometimes an advantage over games which require the assembling of a team. It has endless possibilities for scientific perfection; and it has all the qualities of an exciting conflict. Though it may lack the discipline which comes from team work, this quality is present in doubles play. It is also adaptable to the physical needs of all, because it may be played with almost any degree of intensity, though it does tend to become a rather strenuous game.

These illustrations are sufficient to show what is meant by the gradation of games according to complexity. The lowest group contains diversions which involve merely various forms of physical exercise. This class is a very large one; and the activities within it may be subdivided according to the interest they excite and the physical benefit they afford. The next class would include those sports which have a definite objective, such as is implied in a game. The element of competition may be introduced into all of these, though some of them are much more naturally solitaire games than others. This class gradually merges into a somewhat higher grade where competition necessarily enters, as it does in racing. Above this group, in the highest class of all, should be placed those games which contain the element of conflict, that is, the opportunity for one side to counteract or check the efforts of the other by clever play.

The more complex games are the more educative, but they are, on the other hand, less relaxing. On this account they are better adapted to the young, or at least to those who still have plenty of energy to expend in play. Wherever several types of games are suitable for recreation, the more complex should be preferred, because they are the more interesting and the more stimulating to the faculties.

Recreational needs of different classes in the population. From this brief outline of the various types of games, we may next turn to a consideration of the different classes in society which should be provided with some form of recreation.

Of the kinds of play desirable for children, little need be said, for these have been the subject of special study by kindergartens, and are now the most efficiently organized of all forms of recreation. It will be sufficient merely to mention a few of the principles involved in the right kind of play for children. With the very young play is hardly distinguishable from education. Indeed, their formal education gradually emerges out of their play; and the principles governing the two are not dissimilar. The educative process really begins as soon as their excess energy can be directed towards a given end, instead of being allowed to expend itself merely in running about and shouting. At first the teacher should seek to bring about concentration of attention and direct the energy entirely through play, and physical play at that. Later the mental faculties can be more directly employed, and coördination between the mental and physical powers begins. To meet these requirements, two rules in the choice of games should be observed. First, games should be of the simplest sort. Complex games are from their nature unsuitable before good coördination of the nervous and muscular systems has been attained. As this coördination improves, games of higher and higher degrees of complexity may be successfully introduced. The second rule is that activities for children should be frequently varied. This is true both of games and of the more serious educational exercises. If a game requires an attention too prolonged, the child becomes weary and the play takes on the semblance of work. It is desirable to have

an alternation of quiet mental exercises with actual physical play.

The recreational problem for older children is somewhat different from that of the very young for, as children mature, their play does not continue to be so much a part of their education. School work becomes differentiated into a separate activity, and play is resorted to as a relief from mental exertion. Recreation for young people of school age presents the fewest difficulties of all age groups. Here the chief problem is to supply sufficient facilities, rather than to select the most suitable games or sports. Assuming that children spend a large part of the day in the school room, recreations should so far as possible consist of outdoor sports, graded somewhat according to physical strength and maturity. With physical maturity young people enter the period of their highest efficiency for the most complex and strenuous games, though such games may be begun at a much earlier age. It is important, therefore, that adequate facilities should be provided so that young people may freely participate in such games as tennis and baseball—games which provide sufficient outlet for surplus energies, and at the same time develop and coördinate the physical and mental faculties. Games of this type are sufficiently numerous and varied so that individual tastes and physical needs can be met. Tennis and golf have the advantage over baseball and football that they are more likely to be continued later in life. The latter are usually abandoned after school days are over, frequently leaving the individual without any habitual form of physical exercise. For this reason it is highly desirable that young people should learn some game which they may continue to play as adults.

Such forms of exercise as walking and mountain climbing are suitable for any age group. They are useful diversions because they develop social instincts as well as satisfy physical needs; but they lack the excitement and interest involved in games.

The provision of recreation for adults presents a more difficult problem than that for young people of school age, because their needs are more varied. Also the purpose of recreation

for them is somewhat different. Since the age of physical development is past, recreation is needed more for relaxation and diversion than for physical training or for the expenditure of surplus energy. Nevertheless even for them, active forms of recreation are still essential for physical and mental efficiency; and any community makes a great mistake if it fails to take account in its recreational program of the needs of adults.

Although the task of providing suitable types of recreation for adults is difficult, actually the sources available to draw upon are the most numerous of all. Many adults get sufficient diversion after their work by merely reading or by visiting with friends. Others find recuperation in the pursuit of a hobby or of a more serious avocation. Recreations of this kind can be utilized only by adults who have considerable surplus energy and also varied intellectual interests. The fact that serious pursuits can be used for recreational purposes shows the recuperative effect of turning from one occupation to another, provided the avocation is a fascinating one. The vast majority of persons, however, must find their recreation in some more exciting form of external stimulus requiring less intellectual effort.

Adults whose work requires considerable physical activity, especially if it is out of doors, are well served by mental forms of recreation like cards or chess; or, if they are fatigued at the end of the day, passive forms of entertainment may be sufficient. Moving pictures are particularly well adapted to those who have had physical exertion and require relaxation and entertainment.

Adults who lead a sedentary indoor life should have a form of recreation which involves outdoor exercise, and their need is admirably filled by the game of golf. This game well deserves its popularity, for it combines moderate exercise with a fascinating form of competition, and provides also an opportunity for pleasant social intercourse. In fact it is not too much to say that it has revolutionized the lives of many business men by providing so pleasantly a much needed diversion from business cares. It is entirely wrong to regard the pursuit of golf as a mere indulgence or a frivolity. Its large and en-

thusiastic following indicates rather that it satisfies a real need in social life. Its great defect is that it requires the use of a large area outside city limits, and so the expense involved restricts it to the well-to-do. Facilities for its extension should be increased at public expense, or else another game of more modest requirements should be invented for people of moderate means. It also needs to be supplemented by an interesting indoor game suitable for the winter months. Billiards and bowling are excellent games for winter entertainment, but even these do not seem to fulfil the need adequately.

A separate discussion of recreation for women is hardly necessary in modern times, because women now engage in much the same sports as men. Differences in choice are now due less to sex distinction than to individual differences in strength, in the character of occupations, or in daily routine of life. A few women indulge profitably in tennis, or even in track athletics, which many men would find too strenuous. Nevertheless, women on the average still seem to get along with forms of recreation requiring less strenuous physical exercise than those which men prefer; and they probably follow to a somewhat greater extent than men the more passive forms of recreation.

Deficiencies of Recreational Life. The foregoing discussion of types of recreation is an attempt to indicate broadly the recreational requirements of communities. We are now prepared to consider to what extent these requirements are actually satisfied. If it appears that they are adequately met, then the problem is to ascertain what are the defects or inadequacies of our present facilities, and to determine what improvements are possible. Such an inquiry assumes that practically all members of society do need some form of regular recreation to promote their own efficiency, and so, indirectly, the welfare of the social group. That is, a variety of recreational associations, formal or informal, must be regarded as a normal part of a healthy and complete social organization.

Many persons take no recreation. If one surveys even superficially the manner of life of the people, either in the city or in the country, one cannot fail to be impressed by the

fact that very many of them have little or no recreation, and that their lives are the more dreary and monotonous because of this deprivation. The reasons for this neglect are many. The most obvious, and the one which probably affects the largest numbers, is due to the exhausting character of their work. This is no fault of the individual; rather it is due to a serious defect in the economic system, which needs of course to be remedied as rapidly as possible. Industrial laborers who are fatigued with their daily work have neither the energy nor the means to seek entertainment unless it is provided close at hand. Many who formerly spent their free time in the saloons, now avail themselves of the moving picture theatres; but many more are still without any wholesome form of recreation whatever. Fortunately the attention of the public has been drawn to the needs of industrial workers, and their condition is constantly being improved.

A class which has attracted much less notice consists of women who work continuously at home duties. Although their lives are very restricted, it would be incorrect to represent them as having no leisure. At one period of the day or another, leisure is usually theirs; and frequently they spend it in social intercourse with their neighbors. This might be profitable and stimulating, but frequently it degenerates into indulgence in malicious gossip or into petty quarrels, and these tend to fall into the class of dissipations rather than of recreations.

In rural districts the labor of men and women is long and tiring; and, moreover, the isolation of the countryside makes refreshing diversions more difficult to find. Instead of enjoying regular periods of recreation, people get along with occasional opportunities for extreme relaxation or excitement, such as are offered by the circus, the country fair, the camp meeting, or celebrations accompanying a holiday. While such events relieve the monotony of rural existence, they do not accomplish the benefits which follow more moderate and regular forms of recreation. These rural diversions may be recreative in the long run in so far as they enliven and stimulate; but their immediate effect is likely to be unsettling, so

that time is often required for a readjustment to the old monotonous routine of work. On the whole amusements in rural districts are too frequently violent distractions from outside, rather than recuperative activities forming a normal part of the routine of life.

There is another group of adults who take no recreation merely because they never learned to play in their youth. Having never developed the gay, spontaneous spirit induced by youthful play, they now lack the interest and enterprise to participate in regular recreation. They are not conscious of any deprivation, because they have never been accustomed to diversions. Rather they regard them as mere frivolities which interfere with the serious affairs of life. While persons reared in this unwholesome manner may develop into respected and serious-minded citizens, they are much more likely to become intolerant and critical monitors of the enjoyments of others.

Still another group does not indulge in recreations because its members choose dissipations instead. Although recreations and dissipations grade into each other and are similar on the border line, the extremes of the two are diametrically opposed. People who expend their energies in hard recuperative play are not attracted by extreme forms of dissipation. And those who are excessively dissipated cannot be satisfied with normal methods of recreation, partly because they have no energy left to put into games, but also because they do not find sufficient excitement in ordinary amusements. While dissipations in one form or another are extremely common, it is nevertheless an abnormal condition for healthy individuals to delight in wasting their energies instead of conserving them. The preference for dissipations is a gradually acquired habit, and one of the most dangerous and enticing approaches to the various kinds of dissipation is idleness. This is really a dissipation in itself, for it is a passive method of wasting the energies; and it tends to unfit one for any kind of useful activity. Loafing on the part of young people may seem preferable, from a social point of view, to the consumption of the energies in mischievous and criminal ways; and its immediate

effect is less troublesome. But the process of becoming soft and sluggish through inaction is finally just as demoralizing, and reformation is just as difficult. Laziness is a fault which can best be corrected by arousing the idler's interest in some active sport.

Recreational facilities are not adequate. Proof of the inadequacy of existing facilities is to be found in the fact that many who desire diversions fail to find suitable means to obtain them. Deficiencies are most obvious, first, in the lack of sufficient park and playground space; and, secondly, in the scarcity of specific equipment for sports and games. Facilities have multiplied rapidly in recent years, but they are nevertheless far from what they should be. It has been estimated that the minimum area of playground capacity should be 25 square feet per capita for the child population from five to fifteen years of age. Few of our large cities measure up to this requirement; and in our largest cities considerable areas are still to be found where no playgrounds at all exist.

A government survey of recreational facilities, taken in 1918, gives some interesting comparative data, though the actual facilities reported would no longer represent the equipment at present. Two hundred and thirteen cities were canvassed, and these cities were arranged in five groups according to size. The canvass showed that the largest cities—those with more than 500,000 inhabitants—were less well equipped with both park space and playgrounds than the smaller cities. In as much as the largest cities probably have more need for public park and playground space than the smaller cities, the situation in the largest cities is even less favorable than the comparative statistics would indicate.

As a partial offset to the lack of adequate space, it may be said that cities of the first two classes, that is, those with more than 300,000 inhabitants, spend relatively more on both parks and playgrounds than do the smaller cities. Parks in the large cities have had more labor expended upon them, and they are kept in a more attractive condition. Some of the parks in the smaller cities are mere reservations, still in the natural state; though this does not mean that they are not utilized. It may

be assumed that playgrounds in the largest cities are better equipped on the whole than those in the smaller cities, as a larger sum comparatively is spent upon them. Playground workers, however, are not more numerous compared to the population, though they receive somewhat higher salaries. Medium-sized cities have the largest number of free golf courses, and relatively the largest number of baseball and football fields, and they lead in the number of free public concerts. In a variety of ways these smaller cities show the greatest amount of enterprise in providing recreational attractions.

Recreations are not wisely chosen. Next to the insufficiency of recreational facilities, the most evident fault in our recreational life is the poor selection of the amusements available. The pursuit of unsuitable forms of recreation may be a less serious fault than their complete neglect; but maladjustments greatly reduce the possible effectiveness of a recreational organization. The selection of recreations seems to be largely a matter of chance, for, when people are left to choose their own games without assistance, they seldom seem to make their selection on rational grounds. They are likely to try games which their friends are playing; but, if they do not find these as enjoyable as they expect, they easily lapse into the rôle of spectators and satisfy themselves with watching others play. Their sole standard of choice is likely to be the immediate pleasure a game arouses, rather than the ultimate good to be derived from it. And frequently a game which seems most attractive at the start is not the one best suited to the player.

One of the most obvious maladjustments in the recreational life of today is the extensive participation in passive rather than active forms of recreation. Passive forms have their place, to be sure, and should not be condemned. The pleasure derived from theatrical performances and the interest aroused by athletic contests, such as baseball and football games, is for the most part normal and beneficial. But such diversions are best suited to those who are weary from their work and need relaxation and entertainment. Although all classes and all ages of the population may profitably indulge in them

occasionally, it is quite abnormal for healthy, active young people to make passive recreations their chief diversion.

Recreational surveys show that moving picture entertainments are the most popular form of amusement for school children; and many attend so frequently as to make it obvious that these provide their chief, if not their only, method of recreation. The conclusion naturally drawn from the surveys that have been made is that moving picture shows are patronized altogether too much by young people. This criticism is based entirely on the type of recreation involved. The quality of the pictures presented, and their direct effects on morality, will not be discussed here. In fact this phase of the subject would be beyond the limits of a brief discussion of forms of recreation. If a particular theatrical representation, or a particular recreational center, is having a demoralizing effect, the situation becomes a moral rather than a purely recreational problem. However, the point may be emphasized in passing, that ideals are greatly influenced by artistic presentations through the process of suggestion. In as much, then, as young people who make a practice of attending moving picture shows have not used up their surplus energy in the recreation itself, they are likely to turn their energies later in the direction suggested by the films. With young children the danger is the occasional unfortunate suggestion, rather than the moral effect of the representation as a whole, since their minds do not follow the logical sequence of events to the end, as the censors of the films seem to assume.

In addition to the objection that moving pictures offer only a passive form of entertainment, the fact that they take place indoors, in dark and often poorly ventilated halls, would of itself suggest that they were much less desirable from a physical standpoint than an open air game, and that their indulgence during the daylight hours, at least, should be an exceptional rather than a regular form of entertainment.

Though the most obvious maladjustment in recreational life is the undue substitution of passive for active forms of recreation, other minor faults are common. When active recreations are indulged in, they are often poorly adapted both to physical

and to mental needs. The detailed work of adaptation, to be successful, has to be undertaken by a competent director. His task is to achieve such an adjustment of recreations to the daily routine of work, that each individual shall obtain both mental and physical exercise at an expenditure of energy suited to his particular powers. Preferences must of course be taken into account also in organizing recreations, because personal interest and pleasure in an activity is an essential part of the conditions necessary for profit. This work of adapting recreations to the needs of the people has not yet been attempted in many communities; but the efficiency of the population, as well as its means of enjoyment, would be greatly increased if intelligent adjustments could be made.

Possible Reforms in Organized Recreation. Recreational activities in most communities are so casual and unorganized as to indicate that these interests have lagged far behind other forms of social life. The fact is that, in new societies, recreational associations are not so urgently needed as are other institutions; and, even in more advanced societies, their importance is not fully recognized, so that their development on scientific lines is hardly begun. In turning, therefore, from the examination of recreational deficiencies to a consideration of methods of improvement, we are confronted at once with the need for fundamental constructive work, rather than with the task of correcting defects. In as much as effective organization of recreations really does not exist, progress involves pioneering along new lines. The question is not one of reorganization, because no organization in the proper sense of the term exists. To evolve an efficient organization, experimentation must be carried on until the needs of each community are satisfied; but practical reform must be preceded by a more general recognition of the fact that recreational associations are not merely a desirable, but a necessary, part of a well-organized and efficient community. The community must also realize that such associations will not evolve spontaneously, but require the direction of a scientifically trained leader to obtain the best results.

A director of recreation is needed. The first step in advance

then would be for communities to engage directors of recreation, as they now have teachers of various subjects in the schools. The duties of such directors should be the organization and oversight, rather than the detailed supervision, of play. A recreational director should not be expected to become the immediate leader in sports, either for adults or for children. Such leadership would require a large force of directors and would be both unnecessary and undesirable. After the director has organized certain sports, as for instance, a series of baseball teams, their immediate management and control should be placed in the hands of the participants themselves, with only enough permanent supervision to ensure the carrying out of the design. Young people become demoralized rather than helped by having all initiative and responsibility taken out of their hands. Recreational surveys show, however, that young people often do need an active leader to start and put through the preliminary work of organization; but that afterwards as much responsibility as possible should be left to the players. A director should, however, be easily accessible for consultation and advice; and he should keep himself thoroughly informed as to what is being accomplished. But, although he may give general instructions to beginners concerning rules and methods of play, or at least provide for such instruction, he should not allow himself to be diverted to the special task of coaching athletes or of training championship teams; because the duty of the recreational director is not to perfect a few expert players to engage in contests for others to watch, but to encourage as many people as possible to participate in games or engage in some regular form of recreation.

The success of a city's recreational department would depend largely upon the personnel of those administering it, and consequently great care should be exercised in selecting a recreational director. He should above all be socially popular and endowed with a personality attractive both to young and to old. He needs to have a broad comprehension of what community life ought to be, and should appreciate the needs of individuals of all classes and their limitations as well. He

should also possess administrative ability. In addition to these personal qualities, he should have had a specialized scientific training in physical education. This does not mean merely an acquaintance with different kinds of games, but an understanding also of their physical and intellectual values. Schools of physical education are already being organized with courses of study fairly well adapted to the training of recreational experts; and these courses will be improved as needs become better understood. The point of the whole movement is that a new profession is developing, which is intended to care for this hitherto neglected phase of social life.

The organization of a recreational department. Another phase of the problem of establishing a community recreational organization is determining the position of such an organization in the community and the character and degree of control to be exercised over it.

In many communities the recreational department is made part of the school system, because this appears to be the easiest and most natural procedure. According to this arrangement the director is under the control of the superintendent of schools; and the department devotes itself to the needs of young people of school age. There is some advantage, at least to school children, in such a relationship, in as much as recreational and physical training are definitely made a part of the educational program. Coöperation between teachers and recreational directors is assured; and a better coördination between work and play periods is made possible. Also an administrative gain of a different sort is realized in the protection a recreational department would receive from undue political interference, or from unwarranted influence from private interests.

The objections to such a connection, however, are so great as to make it undesirable for most communities as a permanent arrangement. The chief objection is that the conception of the duties of a civic recreational department which limits its scope to the care of school children is too narrow. An effective recreational organization should take for its field the community as a whole, and minister to the needs of all

ages and classes. In order to accomplish this larger task, the natural arrangement would seem to be to make the organization a separate department of the municipality, in the same way as the general health of the community is entrusted to a separate department. This is the arrangement in the excellent recreational department of Detroit, where the superintendent is directly responsible to the mayor. Under this system the influence and authority of the director is much greater than it would be if he were made a mere subordinate in the school system. The theories and technique of organized recreation could also be put into operation much more easily by an independent official with the requisite training, than by an expert under the direction of a school superintendent who lacked the specialized training.

Some degree of popular control, however, over a recreational department, especially during the period of its organization, would seem always expedient, instead of leaving its development to the casual oversight of a city manager or a city council. Communities differ so greatly in their needs that local provisions for friendly counsel and advice, if not for strict control, is likely to be desirable. To obtain effective coöperation between an expert director and the representatives of the citizens, such a system as that frequently used in the organization of public libraries might serve as a useful model. An unpaid committee of citizens could be appointed to act as a consultative body as well as a final board of control. If this committee were truly representative of different classes and different ages, it could furnish information concerning existing needs and could give valuable advice concerning the practicability of new measures. While the plans of such departments might differ in details in adapting themselves to the particular conditions existing in different communities, this type of organization is usually well adapted to any undertaking which is still in the experimental stage.

Scope of the work of the recreational department. The scope of the work of a department of recreation should not be too limited. In the first place, a broad interpretation should be given to the meaning of recreation, so that the de-

partment could be made to assist in utilizing profitably the spare time of all the citizens of a community, instead of limiting itself to the organization of a few outdoor sports. In the second place, the department should possess sufficient authority so that it could exercise some control over all kinds of recreational enterprises, both public and private. All public playgrounds should be under the direction of the department; and private enterprises established for profit, such as moving picture theatres and billiard halls, should be brought under its supervision. This supervision ought to be more than sufficient than merely to ensure a decent moral tone in amusement resorts. It should be constructive enough so that the various commercialized recreational centers could be incorporated into a general program of recreational activities.

The department should also be granted authority over the establishment of new resorts, and, if necessary, over methods of conducting them. Perhaps it would be unwise to restrict private enterprise too much in the establishment of amusement centers, because usually they are not overabundant. But it should not be forgotten that recreation demands variety in amusement, and that a city might easily become oversupplied with one type of diversion, simply because of the success of the original venture. A director with a well-balanced program might find it necessary to encourage certain forms of amusement and to discourage others, with no intention of suppressing private enterprises in general.

The recent extension of places of amusement for private gain has presented a difficult social problem, which has not yet been adequately solved. The danger is that private enterprise will exploit the universal desire for pleasure and excitement, with little regard for the effect of their offerings upon the individual, and with no comprehension of the significance of any all-round recreational system. Promoters tend to sell to the public those things which can be marketed through the medium of extensive advertising; and the public, lacking definite recreational standards, is likely to accept amusements offered, without selective judgment.

Private enterprises should be given full credit for their

achievements. The moving picture industry, for example, has brought to all communities, for a small fee, exhibitions so elaborate and so costly that no single community could possibly produce them. Nevertheless the very success of this enterprise has tended to overextend one type of recreation to the exclusion of others more profitable to young people. Even this general type of amusement could be varied advantageously by the introduction of pageants or of plays, produced by local talent, which would be a source of pleasure and profit because they were local enterprises.

Undoubtedly the achievement of a well-balanced and scientifically arranged recreational program in a community would necessitate control of all amusement agencies by one head. And this authority, if wisely used, need not be made too repressive to forfeit the advantages of private capital and private management, still so much needed in the general recreational field.

A recreational survey desirable. As soon as a recreational department is once organized, its program has to be planned; and, to provide the accurate and concrete information upon which it should be based, most communities would find it well worth while to make a preliminary survey of existing conditions. This survey should make a direct canvass of places of amusement, and note their number and character; and it should also report on the chief sports and amusements carried on through private initiative. Finally, it ought, so far as possible, to give some idea of how the young people of the community habitually spend their leisure time. With this information available, a real estimate of the needs of the community could be made and a tentative program could be outlined. Greatly as recreational needs vary in different communities, in most cases it will be found that certain agencies exist which should be suppressed or greatly modified; that others should be extended or enlarged; and, in general, that the facilities both for outdoor and indoor sports should be multiplied, especially to meet the needs of a larger number of the poorer people.

The organization of outdoor sports. Outdoor sports should

be the first to be organized, because they are most valuable, and also because they can be the most easily provided. In cold climates arrangements should be made for winter sports, such as skating, coasting, and skiing; but in most communities summer games are by far the most important. These should be supplied in sufficient variety to attract everyone. Games, such as tennis and golf, which may be played by adults as well as young people, ought to be given the first preference.

The chief obstacle in providing adequate facilities for these games is that they require rather expensive equipment. Even baseball requires spacious, though not carefully prepared, grounds. Initial costs are so high that recreational organizations are liable to make compromises, or to be satisfied with halfway measures, which actually defeat their real purpose. Expenditures for games may seem to many entirely unproductive; but in the long run they prove to be less costly and more educative than schools for juvenile delinquents.

Of course not all the population by any means will have to be provided with play facilities at public expense. Private clubs usually supply the needs of the well-to-do classes; but in most cities these should be more generally supplemented by free public grounds. That public golf courses and tennis courts fill a real need in the few cities where they are provided is evident by the patronage which they receive.

Provision for these more active sports may be advantageously supplemented by opportunities for milder forms of exercise, such as swimming and boating, or by walking clubs for those who desire more of the social element.

Notwithstanding the large number of outdoor games available, there still seems to exist a real need for an interesting game to take care of the left-overs, so to speak; that is, for those who show no special aptitude for the more difficult scientific games. Such a game, to be serviceable, should be one which could be played by a varying number of persons; and it should provide exercise and excitement without requiring great skill or much previous practice. It would entice many persons into active exercise who are now merely onlookers.

The organization of indoor amusements. The organization

of indoor amusements as a municipal undertaking is usually less common than that of outdoor amusements. Many families provide satisfactorily for their own needs; and private interests furnish so many places of entertainment that it is usually assumed that indoor recreational needs are amply met; but this is not true. The larger part of the population of our cities is deprived of desirable forms of indoor recreation; and this frequently means that they have no recreation at all, because so many people have leisure only in the evening.

The chief problem of indoor recreation is usually that of obtaining suitable buildings or rooms. When these can be obtained, the expense of equipment is less than that of providing for outdoor sports. Sometimes temporary accommodations may be found in school buildings, or possibly in the vestries of churches; but usually such rooms are poorly adapted to the purpose, and communities should as soon as possible arrange special up-to-date social centers. In small towns one building, if well located, is sufficient; but in large cities several buildings should be provided in different neighborhoods especially adapted to the needs of people in each locality.

The city of Boston, making use of its public school buildings, has established 13 social centers in as many districts. In these centers five kinds of activities are carried on: civic, social, educational, recreational, and industrial. Eighty-two schoolhouses are used for community purposes of one kind or another.

While community centers may be used for a great variety of activities, they should first of all care for recreational needs. A good gymnasium with baths, and whenever possible a swimming pool, should be considered necessary parts of the equipment. Facilities for games for young and old ought to be provided, and small rooms should be available for private social parties. In addition, the building should contain a good-sized auditorium which could be used for lectures, concerts, and other forms of entertainment. Communities which have established successful social centers find that they come to be utilized at all periods of the day as well as of the evening.

They are a great convenience as informal meeting places or resting places for out-of-town visitors. Moreover, if centrally located, they prove convenient places also for public gatherings for the discussion of topics of general interest; civic organizations often make their headquarters there; and they also serve as the natural headquarters for committee meetings. In short, a successful social center is a school for nurturing civic consciousness, as well as an institution for promoting community activities.

The Duties of a Recreational Department Summarized. The real purpose of organized recreation, and the real function of the recreational director, should not be misconceived because of these various suggestions for a civic recreational program. There should never be any attempt to force people to take recreation, nor to direct them into amusements which do not attract them. But, as most people do desire some form of recreation, a community recreational department is intended merely to assist them in satisfying wisely and adequately their recognized needs. Moreover, there should be no attempt to do for others what they can do very well for themselves. Those in the community who can provide their own recreations should not be molested. The larger the number that are able to satisfy their own needs, the better is the situation, and the simpler will be the work of the directors. In fact, the ideal to strive for is a situation in which the largest possible number will be able to satisfy their recreational requirements without outside assistance. But always there will be some who will need direction and perhaps definite instruction; and a majority of the population will never be able to obtain the proper facilities for recreation unless public provision is made for them.

The chief functions of a recreational department then are: first, to provide ample and suitable facilities for both outdoor and in-door recreations; and, secondly, to assist young people to develop intelligently their natural instinct to play. If they are taught to play properly while they are young, it will be easy for them to continue to do so later in life; and the problem of adult recreations will be greatly simplified, for adults can usually organize and direct their own recrea-

tions satisfactorily if they have always been accustomed to play. Of course in any community a recreational department, though desirable, is not actually so essential as some of the other community organizations; but a department under a competent director can extend and perfect these activities to the great advantage of community life.

Conclusion. The advantages of recreation need special emphasis in modern times, because, under the present pressure of industrial and social life, time and opportunity for suitable recreations are not easily found, and the need for them is likely to be overlooked. Yet well-selected recreations taken regularly contribute greatly to health, both of body and of mind; for, besides providing physical exercise, they furnish at the same time diversion from business cares and responsibilities. Moreover, an exciting sport, or a suitable avocation, provides a positive interest, which enriches life by relieving the routine and fatigue of labor. If a plea for the general enrichment of life is not a convincing argument for recreation to men of practical affairs, it may be added that it actually increases the efficiency of labor by arousing alertness and stimulating vigor of body and of mind. For the benefit of those who are concerned for the nation's defenses, and who are troubled at the apparent frivolity of the young generation, assurance may be given that athletic sports are a better long time preparation for war than is military drill. Athletic sports teach individual subordination and coöperation; and at the same time they cultivate resourcefulness and quick coördination of physical and mental faculties. Their discipline produces better soldiers, because it produces better men. Considering the demonstration in the recent war of the superiority of English and American athletically trained men over those soldiers who had undergone a long period of routine military drill, the present pressure on the part of certain interests to substitute military for athletic training seems incomprehensible.

Indeed, the value of regular recreation is so great that any successful recreational organization will contribute not merely to the well-being of the individual, but also to the effectiveness

of the other social institutions; and it will therefore enrich the whole social life. It will be of most direct service to the family and to the school. In helping to utilize surplus energy profitably, it makes youth more amenable to discipline and more willing to engage in study or in work. Moreover, organized recreation lightens the duties and responsibilities of the courts and penal institutions, because it helps to entice young people away from those dissipations which lead to juvenile delinquencies. More indirectly, opportunities for varied diversions would contribute to the efficiency of the economic organization by making the lives of adults more healthful and pleasurable.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What is your favorite form of recreation? What do you consider its desirable qualities?
2. Make a list of games, or recreations, which you consider most desirable (a) for young people, (b) for adults.
3. What are the benefits to be derived from taking some form of regular recreation?
4. Explain the difference between recreations and dissipations and give examples.
5. Do you take your recreation with school associates, church associates, or with neighborhood associates?
6. What forms of recreation do you take at home?
7. Do you enjoy moving picture shows? Do you consider them a desirable form of recreation?
8. Is it easier to find suitable recreations in winter, or in summer? In the day time or in the evening?
9. Are there sufficient opportunities for recreation in your community? If not, what is lacking?
10. Investigate some community social center and describe the various ways in which it is used.
11. What can be done to interest more people in regular recreations?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

BEARD, CHARLES A., *American City Government*, Chapter 13.
BOWEN, W. P., and MITCHELL, E. D., *The Theory and Practice of Organized Play.*

Case, Clarence M., *Outlines of Introductory Sociology,* Chapter 42.
Cleveland Recreational Survey.
Curtis, Henry S., *The Practical Conduct of Play.*
—— *Play and Recreation for the Open Country.*
Good, Alvin, *Sociology and Education,* Chapter 7.
Gulick, Luther H., *A Philosophy of Play.*
Harrison, S. H., "Social Conditions in an American City," *Springfield Survey,* Chapter 5.
Johnson, George E., *Education by Play and Games.*
Lee, Joseph, *Play in Education.*
Lumley, Frederick E., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 17.
Russell Sage Foundation, *Public Recreation.*
Steiner, Jesse F., *Community Organization,* Chapters 8 and 9.
Wood, Arthur E., *Community Problems,* Chapters 14, 15, 17 and 18.
Zeublin, Charles, *American Municipal Progress,* Chapters 14 and 16.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHURCH

The Universal Prominence of the Church. The church is one of the most fundamental and universal of all the institutions of society. In American villages, the spire of the church building has always been a distinctive feature of the landscape; and in European countries, the church, or the cathedral, is always one of the oldest and most imposing structures of every town and city. Similarly in Moslem cities, the graceful minarets of many mosques form one of the most striking features of the scene. In early days in America the church and the schoolhouse, often placed side by side, were the indications of a settled and organized community.

What was the real significance of this building which towered high above the school, and was more costly and imposing than any commercial structure or civic building? The church represented the religious beliefs and aspirations of the people; and the grandeur of the physical symbol of religion showed, in theory at least, the relative importance of spiritual as compared with physical needs.

The Fundamentals of Religious Belief. While the intention in this chapter is to discuss the church as a social institution, rather than to consider the forms and dogmas of religious faiths, an explanation of what religious faith really means is a necessary preliminary to any discussion of the purpose of church organizations, and to any estimate of their success. Although the different religions vary greatly in their beliefs as well as in practices, they do have a sufficient number of points in common to indicate the existence of a general similarity of purpose.

These common points may be summarized briefly under three heads. In the first place, all advanced ethical religions

are based upon a common belief in the existence of spiritual forces superior to and more powerful than material forces. Or, it might be more accurate to say, these religions have regarded material objects and forces merely as manifestations of a still higher type of force, which has been called spiritual. Secondly, these religions agree in ranking man as a superior type of animal, possessing powers or possibilities differing from those of the lower animals, not merely in degree but also in kind. The difference in degree is evident from man's superior intellectual attainments; but the difference in kind is more subjective and less easy to demonstrate. It consists of a faculty or capacity in man which, if properly developed, enables him to perceive and utilize this superior spiritual force. Under certain conditions, indeed, he may attract and accumulate spiritual energy to such an extent as to increase his efficiency, and sometimes even to attain a new type of power which seems superhuman to those who understand material forces alone. Thirdly, the ethical religions agree that conditions under which human beings attain spiritual development are brought about through the observance of numerous rites and practices. These when analyzed fall into two groups having somewhat dissimilar objects in view. The one set of practices may be classed under the head of morality; and, judging them from the religious rather than the social point of view, they are intended to keep the individual from becoming materialistic and self-centered. The second set of practices may be called religious; and they have for their object the development of the higher centers of the mind, and the subordination of the lower centers which control the physical processes.

For the sake of clarity the relationship of morality to religion should be further elucidated. The rules of moral conduct have two distinct purposes in view; the one social and the other religious. From the social point of view, morality is merely a set of rules which serve to facilitate social relations. These safeguard individual rights and lessen friction between individuals living in close contact. The social value of morality was the first to be recognized; and, therefore, rules of

morality developed originally as something entirely distinct from religious beliefs and practices. They continued to be distinct as long as religion was occupied merely with the attempt to placate and control the forces of nature; but, as soon as the connection between conduct and character was perceived, religion began to make morality a part of its own fundamental requirements. From the religious point of view then, morality is an aid or a means rather than an end of religious belief. It is a preliminary condition to that spiritual attainment which is the real object of religious practices.

The Purpose of the Church. The foregoing is a brief description of the essence of religious belief, the teaching of which is the primary duty of the church as an organization. But these fundamental religious truths have become so clouded and confused, sometimes through the diversion of attention to unimportant dogmas, and sometimes through the influence of unworthy and selfish leaders, that the churches have ordinarily stood for something quite inferior to this. Some churches have become ethical societies, prominent in righteousness and good works; and others have become associations for the practice of elaborate religious ceremonials; but of spiritual laws some of them have never so much as heard.

In other words, the churches themselves, failing in subjective spiritual perception, have instituted in its place formal and material observances, thus substituting means for ends. They are, so to speak, concentrating on the grammar of a language instead of reaching out to grasp the ideas embodied in it. Occasionally some prophet with real perception arises to break through the crusts of those forms and ceremonies which are threatening to strangle the expression of truth; and he may temporarily restore some life and meaning to old doctrines. But, after a period of renewed light and understanding, the church usually sinks back into its old rut of organized routine and ritual.

Even when the church has failed to comprehend its possibilities, however, it should not on that account be condemned as an utter failure, nor as a superfluous institution, for it has ordinarily been a positive force in promoting the finest life of

the community. The church usually reflects the character of its leaders; and these have on the whole been estimable men, if their ideals have sometimes been narrow. So few people of low moral standards enter the church for selfish purposes that they are wholly unrepresentative of the profession as a whole. On the other hand, leaders of fine spiritual perception and attainment are so rare as to be also unrepresentative.

Merely in its function as an organization for ethical teaching and moral training, the church is an indispensable institution in the community. Even among those people who refuse the church any active support, few would maintain that the community would be as attractive and desirable a place to live in if the churches were closed. Churches exert an influence for the promotion of moral conduct and civic responsibility, which extends far beyond the circle of those who attend them.

But most churches do more than merely supply moral teaching and leadership. Frequently they become active social as well as religious agencies, and as such they attempt to reorganize community life on more normal and healthful lines. Different churches specialize in different kinds of social work according to the needs of the districts in which they are located. The most extensive social work is done by the so-called institutional churches, located in the poorer districts of large cities. These churches endeavor to attract people of all ages by offering them educational and cultural opportunities which will enrich their narrow lives. They organize children into clubs and provide amusements for them in salutary surroundings. They furnish young people with headquarters for normal social life; they offer lectures and courses of study to those who have been deprived of school training. They even interest themselves in physical welfare. They teach hygienic modes of life and instruct girls and women in the proper preparation of food and in the care of young children. In short, these churches do all the work of social settlements, and in addition they supplement it with religious services and religious teaching. Churches may be graded all the way from those complicated institutions with an extensive plant in use almost every hour of the week, to those whose spacious build-

ings are opened only for a brief period on Sundays, or possibly once more during the week, for formal religious services, and which attempt no other organized work.

The Character of Church Associations. Before estimating the actual measure of the success of the church, we should recall to mind the form of association which the church organization assumes although something has already been said on this subject in the discussion of associations in general. In the United States church organizations do not represent a uniform type of association, almost all degrees of centralization being included. In many denominations the organizations are entirely local and independent. These may coöperate with similar organizations in other localities for various purposes; but each is self-governing and free from dictation from a higher authority in another place. Here the decentralization is complete, and these churches show the characteristics of the small type of association. In other denominations churches are more closely allied and are kept under the oversight of bishops appointed for particular districts; and in some cases the churches in different districts are united into a national association. The most highly organized church of all is not limited to one country, for it has branches in all parts of the world united into a single organization which is governed by a head located in Rome. This church represents the extreme form of centralization, and it exemplifies many of the characteristics of the large type of association. However, for most of the purposes of this discussion, the separate units rather than the central organization are important; and, even in the Roman Catholic church, each society has a sufficient amount of freedom and independence to permit it to adapt itself to local conditions.

It should be concluded, therefore, that on the whole church organizations in the United States partake of the characteristics of the small association. Either they belong wholly to the small type and are self-contained, or else they are comparatively autonomous parts of a centralized organization. Most of the separate congregations are small, or at most only medium-sized. Relatively few possess such numbers that the

individual is lost in the group, and the organization has become dominant and impersonal. Intimate acquaintanceship among members, sociability, initiative in the pursuit of new undertakings, and general adaptability to changing local conditions are still the dominant characteristics of church organizations.

On the whole the small type of association seems well suited to the work of the church. In case of Protestant denominations, at least, where there does exist federation among the units, or a central direction of the whole denomination, these serve as means for coöperation to achieve larger ends, or for the provision of assistance to weak congregations, rather than for the sake of enforcing unity and submission to central authority. Whatever, therefore, may be the defects and shortcomings in the work of the churches, these can hardly be attributed to form of organization, though undoubtedly there does remain the problem as to just what degree of uniformity and of centralization would best assist the church in making its work effective.

Defects of the Church. *The church fails to attract the people.* In attempting an estimate of the efficiency of the church as a social institution, the observer is first struck by the fact that a comparatively small number of people avail themselves of the opportunities offered for religious worship. To be sure, many of the churches are well filled at their regular services, yet the total attendance in all churches would count up to only a small proportion of the whole population. There is little doubt that the influence of the church upon the population as a whole is much weaker than it should be considering the importance of religion in social life. This fact, however, does not appear so clearly in the membership returns as it does in estimates of attendance. Reports on membership are on the whole favorable. The United States Census gives, for the year 1926, a church membership in all denominations of over 54,000,000, which would be 46 per cent. of the total estimated population. This is larger than the estimate made by Dr. Carroll, which, for 1925, was 40.64 per cent. of the total population. Membership in Protestant churches is somewhat

smaller; and I estimate it to be about one-third of the total Protestant population.

A sign of encouragement is that church membership does not seem to be declining. Dr. Charles Stelze shows that the membership in Protestant churches increased rapidly during the 19th century, growing from 7 per hundred of the population in 1800 to 24 in 1900. From 1900 to 1915, it remained stationary; but, in 1925, it rose to 26 per hundred. Protestant church membership, therefore, seems still to be on the increase, though the rate of increase has greatly declined. If these figures are correct, they should be encouraging; but the rolls of churches are seldom kept up to date, and therefore the lists usually include more than the actual membership.

The real influence of the church upon the people would seem to be better indicated by the numbers who continue in some active relationship with the churches. Information is not available for the country as a whole, but a good indication of conditions may be obtained from some of the intensive local studies which have been made. According to the Springfield Church Survey, while practically all the population in that city classify themselves as belonging to some faith, over one-third have no present connection with any church; and the proportion is much larger for the Protestants than for the Catholics. Out of a total population of 130,000, over 61,000, or 47 per cent., were of the Protestant faith, according to "historic antecedents." But of these, only 35,000, or 58 per cent., could be classified as "present adherents," leaving 42 per cent. as unchurched. Actually, membership in the Protestant churches was reported to be 20,000, or one-third of the total Protestant population.

Figures of church attendance are, perhaps, not very exact; but in Springfield attendance at Sunday morning services was estimated to be one-half of the membership, which would make it 16 per cent. of the total Protestant population. The St. Louis Church Survey brought out the fact that 33 per cent. of the adult Protestant population attended church. Gill and Pinchot, in their study of the country church, estimated that in Windsor County, Vermont, in 1908, only 19 per cent. of the

Protestant population attended church regularly; but, in as much as this was a decline of 30 per cent. in attendance over the preceding 20 year period, the assumption is that a still further decline has taken place since 1908. In other rural districts it was found that from 8 to 18 per cent. of the population attended church.

These figures for church attendance seem to indicate a comparatively small adherence to church organizations. And those estimates which give a church membership so much larger than average attendance at services, if correct, can be explained only on the assumption that the church makes a strong appeal at certain periods but fails to make its influence continuous.

Estimates of church attendance in European countries are even smaller than those for the United States. In Berlin it is said that not over 2 per cent. of the Protestant population attend church regularly, though the attendance at Catholic churches is somewhat greater. In Paris it is claimed by church representatives that from 10 to 15 per cent. of the population are fairly regular church attendants. In smaller places the church probably reaches a somewhat larger proportion of the population. Whether the percentage is a little smaller or a little larger is a matter of minor importance to this discussion. The fact remains that too small a number are reached directly by the churches, for, if "man is a religious animal," the majority, rather than a small minority, should be attracted by some form of religious worship.

The church has been defended for its apparent failure on several grounds. It has been pointed out that the relationship between the church organization and the individual is a twofold one. However faithfully the church does its work, it has no power of compulsion over the individual. He may respond to its appeal or not as he sees fit; so the church should not receive all the blame if the total population is not reached. The attraction of religious services has been regarded in the same way as that of music, or of the dramatic art, or of intellectual activities. Practically everyone is supposed to show more or less response to music, yet not everyone attends

concerts. Nearly every mind is capable of development, yet not everyone engages in active intellectual exercises. It has been maintained that in everyone there exists also some degree of religious feeling, but that the majority of people, for one reason or another, neglect its development even as they neglect other possibilities of development. Religious leaders themselves, however, would contend that, although there might be some analogy between religious and artistic impulses, the former are so much more vital to the welfare both of the individual and of society that similar conclusions should not be drawn concerning them.

It may be true that the churches cannot be expected to reach one hundred per cent. of the population, yet the question remains as to what proportion they ought to reach. If the reported membership of the churches as a whole is deemed satisfactory, it would still seem evident that church attendance is much below the desired amount.

Still it is often claimed, and with justice, that religious interest and religious observance are not properly measured by church attendance, and that many people manifest the religious spirit who never do attend or support the churches, because they do not find in them the inspiration which they seek.

While it is undoubtedly true that religious spirit is not to be measured by church attendance, it is not to the credit of the churches that so many remain outside their doors who are really religiously inclined, because they fail to find inspiration and guidance in the great organization specially formed for religious instruction. The situation would be more comprehensible if there were but one church and one form of worship, because individual differences are so great as to demand a considerable variety of beliefs and modes of spiritual expression. But at present there are so many independent churches that any serious-minded truth seeker might be expected to find satisfaction in one or another. That so few can would seem to reflect upon the spirit or the methods of the churches themselves.

Church attendance is perfunctory. In addition to the fact that so few are attracted by the church, the careful observer

could also note that many of those accustomed to attend church go as a matter of habit, or as a mere formality; and that actually they are little influenced by its professions and observances. This weakness is closely akin to the preceding, and is only a little less serious. In fact the two may indicate only different degrees of the same phenomenon; to some the church makes no appeal and to others the relationship is merely a formal one. In either case we are led back to the same fundamental defect, and that is that the central point of religious radiation is weak.

In defense of the church it is often contended that the blame for the maladjustment between the churches and the people belongs wholly to the latter, that the minds of the masses have been so seduced by materialistic ideas, or by forms of self-indulgence, that religious faith can no longer exercise its normal appeal. Therefore, the defection is not the fault of the church, nor is it to be easily counteracted by church reform. The church, since it teaches absolute truth, must keep on its way uncompromisingly. It cannot be ever-changing to conform to every passing phase of popular thought. The church must wait for people to modify their attitude and outgrow their erroneous views; and, until this comes about, it must be satisfied to attract the few who are responsive to its teaching.

Defenses of this kind are usually directed against what are felt to be the destructive effects of scientific teaching, and the so-called materialistic doctrines. It is quite true that this is an age of scientific thought, and that the discoveries of science have influenced the whole range of ideas of all thinking people. But it is becoming apparent that this phase of intellectual life is not a temporary phenomenon, like a storm in the heavens, so that the church can calmly wait until it passes by and the intellectual atmosphere is once more serene, and responsive to the ancient dogmas. Religious leaders who take this point of view are usually defending an ancient and outworn theology instead of the fundamental spirit of religion. If the scientific point of view has come to stay, then religion must present its message in a form adapted to rational rather than to superstitious minds; and, if the essence of religion is

really universal in its appeal, then religion should be able to make this adjustment without any sacrifice of principle. There is nothing in the modern scientific trend of thought to alter man's fundamental nature. Scientific discoveries have merely helped to free man from outworn traditions and to make him skeptical of arbitrary statements and unsupported claims. It has not solved the problem of the unknown, nor has it lessened his need for inspiration and guidance.

The church tends to become conservative. Of all social institutions, the church is in the greatest danger of becoming crystallized and stereotyped. This is partly because of the widespread attitude of regarding religious beliefs as absolute and unvarying in their nature. If religious organizations ever appeared doubtful or uncertain in their beliefs, they could exert little influence. To gain the confidence and devotion of the masses, religious dogmas have to be presented as complete revelations of eternal truth. After religious sects are once organized, not only are tenets revered as final, but the forms and ceremonies connected with them also take on a sacred character. As time goes on the force of custom adds its weight to maintain unchanged the ancient usages.

As a result, religious organizations do not adapt themselves quickly to changes in other institutions. Their adherents have to continue to conform to archaic expressions of belief until finally a crisis occurs, when new modes of thought in other fields bring a realization of the incompatibility of the two, and of the meaningless character of accustomed ceremonies. Such a crisis is always marked by the spread of unbelief, or by the perfunctory observance of religious rites from mere habit, until a new adaptation is effected, usually through the appearance of a prophet who is successful in restating religious beliefs and reforming the observances to conform to the new spirit of the times. Religious organizations, therefore, instead of keeping pace with readjustments in social conditions, are much more likely to lag behind other institutions, until they are finally brought into conformity by a violent process of adjustment.

Leadership tends to mediocrity. Not only is the religious

organization itself in danger of becoming stereotyped, but its leadership is likely to drift into the hands of the mediocre. After an organization has once been started and definite theological beliefs formulated, innovations are discouraged and originality and independence of thought are no longer cultivated. Ministers or priests who are submissive to direction, who are satisfied to carry out traditional beliefs, and who are faithful in the performance of established ritual, are the type chiefly attracted and usually favored. It is only during times of stress and of readjustment, not in the tranquil periods of undisturbed routine, that forceful, independent thinkers appear.

Clerical education is conservative. To add to the other forms of conservatism in the church, the education of the clergy is little conducive to progressive thought. It is true that the standards for the clergy, from the point of view of training for office, are continually rising. Most denominations are now demanding an educated clergy fitted to become intelligent leaders in their communities. Advanced educational requirements for religious leaders are of course highly desirable; but unfortunately the higher education sometimes diverts candidates from their intended mission and tempts them to become intellectual rather than purely religious leaders. In former times the clergyman with academic training was one of the few educated persons, if not the only one, in a community. In these days of widespread opportunity for a university education, the number of community leaders is larger; and, moreover, public problems are more numerous and complicated, so that the clergyman cannot hope to retain his old prestige as the local specialist in all. Those pastors, therefore, who try to attract large audiences by discussing all types of public questions are probably in the long run weakening rather than strengthening the position of the church in the community.

It is probable that the influence of the clergy as religious leaders would be improved if the education they received were less doctrinal in character. Courses in theological schools have for their chief objective the teaching of an established theology rather than the training of men for community

leadership. A gain would be made if theological students were given more opportunity for the pursuit of sociological subjects, although these should not be made so important as to transform the students into trained social workers instead of religious leaders.

The two tendencies discussed above, the proneness of the church itself to become rigid and traditional, and the liability for the leadership in it to become mediocre, are the chief dangers menacing the primary mission of the church, which is to exert spiritual leadership. These tendencies, though a real menace, are by no means always present. There are still inspiring leaders to be found in the church whose influence is even more permeating than is apparent on the surface. To offset these few, however, the larger number of those who are presuming to take the lead have only a limited vision; and the feeble response which they elicit is the direct result of incompetence.

Proposals for Extending the Influence of the Church. That the influence exercised by the church over the people as a whole is inconsiderable is well recognized, and sundry efforts are being made by the far-sighted to improve the situation. Some reformers believe that churches should emulate business methods and show more enterprise in bringing their work to the attention of the public by means of advertising propaganda. Religious campaigns have, as might be expected, attracted notice; and usually they have increased attendance, at least temporarily. But, as is the case with other advertising schemes, such efforts are permanently successful only if those attracted actually receive the full value promised. So the probability of success in applying advertising measures to the church depends upon the original problem of whether or not the churches can supply the good demanded. Apparently, if the churches can offer this value, they seldom need to resort to commercial methods of advertising to attract the public. If, however, occasions should arise when publicity seemed desirable, there would be considerable choice among methods available to achieve it on the grounds not only of effectiveness but also of good taste. For methods of attracting the atten-

tion of the public ought to harmonize with the nature of that which is offered, otherwise the mind is not prepared for its acceptance.

Others believe that the church would become more popular if only its message were more entertainingly offered; and they have encouraged sensational acts and utterances, calculated to cause discussion and thus attract an audience. Such measures are again forms of advertising, and may now and then be excusable; but, as they do not represent the true spirit of the church, it is doubtful if its spiritual work will be ultimately furthered by attracting curiosity seekers who come merely to witness an extraordinary spectacle. If, however, the intention of this class of reformers is to emphasize the more joyful and profitable side of religion, in place of its fearful and penitential aspects, the innovation should be welcomed. The Protestant faith, at least, has tended too much to be a religion of fear rather than of joy.

Still others hold that the usefulness of the church would be enhanced by making it an active up-to-date forum for the discussion of present-day problems, for they feel that people today are more interested in social than in religious questions. In certain communities such efforts are probably worth while, and they might be introduced as valuable adjuncts to the regular work of the church anywhere; but, when discussion of social problems is substituted for religious instruction, the church is surrendering its religious mission and is becoming merely a lyceum for intellectual enlightenment.

Movements of this kind are usually instituted by persons primarily interested in social and intellectual problems, because they have become convinced that people care little to listen to expositions of religious truth. Their conviction is likely to be due to the fact that their own efforts at religious instruction have not seemed to be appreciated. What these ministers do not understand is that people are in general so unaccustomed to express themselves on religious matters that the ministers themselves often have little inkling of the real needs of the members of their congregations, and that actually the teaching of fundamental religious truths is probably as

acceptable as ever. It is true that few remain who can get much inspiration from the exposition of ancient dogmas. What is needed today is an intelligent re-stating of spiritual truth rather than an abandonment of religious instruction for other kinds of activities.

The Church and Philanthropic Work. The primary mission of the church has now been stated, and its chief dangers and deficiencies discussed; but, in as much as most modern churches have undertaken a wide scope of activities, the varied fields open to them and their achievements in subsidiary lines of work should receive consideration.

The first and most natural of the minor activities of the church is philanthropic work, for this is a part of religious practice. Although religion begins with the individual, it does not end there, but embraces the relationships of individuals one to another. Forms of social service, such as relief for the poor and ministrations to the sick and needy, are natural expressions of the religious spirit; and they might normally be expected to radiate from the church as a center. However, such manifestations of good will and fellowship are normally personal rather than institutional in their nature; and, while many churches do consider philanthropic ministrations among their responsibilities, other churches leave these to the voluntary action of individuals or to professional philanthropists, contenting themselves with being a source of inspiration for good works. What are the relative merits of the two systems? Is it better for the church to organize and carry on philanthropic work as the practical application of religious beliefs? Or is it wiser for them to restrict themselves to the work of inspiration and leave the application to be worked out by other associations, or by individuals?

One of the arguments in favor of having the church organize formal philanthropic work is that in so doing it connects theory and practice. If the church carries on no philanthropic work, to many it seems to be only a dead institution, lacking a living spirit, and deserving the criticism often made that the church exists merely for the teaching of dogmatic

beliefs and remains quite oblivious to the material wants of its people.

Another argument in favor of having the church carry on philanthropic work is that, when its individual members have become inspired by the spirit of helpfulness, they may not fail to find immediate opportunities for making this spirit manifest in good works. The churches ought to be in a position to direct their energies along useful lines while the inclination is still strong. There is undoubtedly an advantage, when promulgating principles, in having at the same time the facilities at hand for putting those principles into operation.

The difficulties of administering church philanthropy successfully are so considerable, however, that churches should not be criticized when they fail to undertake it. In the first place, churches are so restricted by denominational prejudices and rivalries that no one sect can undertake general relief for a city; and it has seldom been found possible to unite all churches for this end. Each is inevitably limited in its efforts to its own parish. Yet the situation at once gives rise to that evil, so long combated, of duplication in relief work. For, while each may intend to confine its charities to its own congregations, boundary lines are not fixed, and in doubtful cases it becomes easy to use alms for proselyting purposes. The recipients of charity themselves are not inclined to exert themselves to limit the scope of charity. They soon learn to solicit aid from many sources, and thus sink to the level of professional beggars.

The duplication of charitable efforts has seldom been corrected by voluntary coöperation of the churches. The general situation has been improved by the establishment of charity organization societies; but the evil can only be eradicated when churches and other philanthropic societies agree to coöperate with a central agency. In a few cases, notably in Buffalo, New York, churches have coöperated successfully with the charity organization society and with one another in relief work. When coöperation is successful, it offers the advantage of the normal expression of the charitable impulse through a

religious organization, combined with suitable care and discrimination in the bestowal of relief.

Another and more subtle danger to which church philanthropy is liable, comes from the spirit in which it is carried on, though it might be expected that in churches at least the relief work would be above criticism. The difficulty is that religions have enjoined giving as a spiritual discipline, emphasizing its effect upon the giver and assuming that it will benefit the receiver. Modern scientific philanthropy has become suspicious of this assumption, and has shown that the recipient has often been demoralized instead of benefited, sacrificed as it were to the spiritual gains of the givers. It has for its part, therefore, concentrated upon the recipient, and has tried so to organize charity that the unfortunate may be strengthened instead of weakened by the relief it renders. It aims to make the needy self-supporting instead of chronically dependent. In attempting this worthy purpose, however, scientific philanthropy has sometimes become so formal and inquisitorial as to take all the joy out of giving, and this is deplorable. Both organizations are one-sided. The problem, then, is to find some combination of the charitable spirit with a scientific analysis of needs, which will save the souls of the givers without at the same time endangering the souls of the receivers. Demands for assistance should not be ignored, though charity should be rendered only after all the conditions necessitating it are understood. While organized charity has been constructive in its assistance, it could advantageously make its charities more personal and spontaneous in spirit. On the other hand, there is no inherent reason why churches should not be constructive in their assistance without sacrificing the spirit of philanthropy.

Considering the dangers attending church philanthropies, then, it would be better for most churches to abandon their own private relief agencies and carry on charitable work through coöperation with the regular charity organization societies. This does not necessarily mean that they should adandon all forms of relief; but that they should at least cooperate to the extent of reporting to a central agency the

amount of support they are giving various families, in order that duplication may be avoided. At present they are likely to feel that giving is a personal matter and their own private affair, and that no harm can possibly result from it.

The Church and Social Work. Next to its assumption of philanthropic work, the most common supplementary rôle of churches is the promotion of social activities. Their social work is often very extensive, including provision for various kinds of entertainments and other forms of recreation for young people, and the organization of clubs for different age groups for study, discussion, or even for athletic contests. The detailed activities need not be described, but their general purpose and their accomplishments should be taken into account.

These social activities, though not directly religious in their nature, are carried on for a twofold purpose. First, they are intended to satisfy a real demand in the lives of the church members. Newcomers to a city, and even some of the older residents, are likely to lack congenial acquaintances; and the church is performing a real service if it provides them with opportunities for making friends and acquaintances within the church circle. Then, again, many young people lack recreational facilities, or any outlet for their surplus energies; and churches often perform much needed service in supplying these deficiences. Secondly, the church has an ulterior object in view. Religious leaders feel that if young people are attracted to the church for social intercourse, it will become to them a center of such pleasant associations that permanent relationships will be fostered, and they will learn to seek it too for religious inspiration. If, however, they feel that the church is only a formidable and gloomy building to which they have to go once a week for a service which wearies rather than interests them, it is easy later for them to slip away from church influences. The feeling of repugnance rather than of pleasure, which has often been produced by early church associations, shows clearly that something has often been radically wrong in the relationship between children and the church. It supports the belief that the church does need to become a

center for social life, if it is to retain its hold upon them as adults.

While much in the present situation gives countenance to this view, yet after all the idea that the church must constitute itself a social center seems opposed to the theory that man is instinctively religious and responds naturally to the religious appeal. The question again arises as to whether people do normally possess religious inclinations, or whether these have to be cultivated artificially through other interests. If the former is the case, the church ought to be able to fulfil its mission by remaining a specialized institution for religious instruction alone, and could leave social activities to the various specialized social agencies. But, if the latter view is correct, then perhaps the church should sometimes at least extend its scope to satisfy social and recreational needs, in order to be assured that these will give birth to religious interests at the proper time.

The fact is that both these conceptions of the task of the church contain a measure of truth, and they are not wholly irreconcilable. Undoubtedly people do normally possess religious inclinations, but in much the same sense that they possess thinking minds. These inclinations exist as possibilities for development under favorable conditions; and those in whom they fail to develop have usually been the victims of neglect or of improper training. A child may easily acquire a dislike for school and, as a result, may resent all mental discipline; or an adult may be uninterested in acquiring an education because he has never had school opportunities. Similarly persons may sometimes become antagonistic to religion because of unfortunate early experiences; or they may ignore it because of neglect in early training. Though religious inclinations may be inherent, they may become perverted through vicious influences, or they may be allowed to die from neglect.

Early religious training may, therefore, be said to be essential for the development of latent religious instincts, and, under ordinary circumstances, this would naturally be carried on in the family rather than in the church. So long as the

family functions normally as a training school for children, the church can fulfil its mission by confining itself to its special field of religious leadership; but, if the family fails in its work of religious instruction, the church may be called upon to supply deficiencies in order to safeguard the effectiveness of its own special task.

The church and the family are as closely interdependent as are the school and the family. In fact, as has already been pointed out, the family is a basic social institution; and the success of other institutions is largely dependent upon the measure of its effectiveness. So when the church is obliged to undertake social activities to attract young people, the reason would seem to be that the family was failing to fulfil one of its functions. Many families who are not at all neglectful of child welfare in other respects seem indifferent to the religious training of their children. That the parents have lost interest in religious education, and regard it as unimportant, is due to the failure of the church on its side to fulfil its primary function adequately. The fault cannot be attributed exclusively to the one institution nor to the other, so closely are the two related. At present the church seems to be suffering not merely from its present deficiencies, but also from the shortcomings of the churches in the previous generation.

The Difficulties Encountered by the Church in Conducting Social Work. Looking at the whole social situation in its broadest aspects, however, the desirability of the assumption of social activities by the church must be judged on the basis of its special fitness to engage in them. There is a danger that the church may compete with the school, or the family, or the various specialized social and recreational organizations. In a complex community there always arises the problem of the overlapping of activities, and the necessity for deciding which agencies are best adapted to perform them. Of course the church may always be expected to carry on such social work as seems essential to its own welfare, though the amount needed will naturally vary in different communities.

If the church undertook, as a part of its regular calling, to

act as an agent for satisfying the more general social and recreational needs of the community, it would be faced with peculiar difficulties. For one thing, most churches, however numerous their membership, are deficient in the numbers of those who would be interested to participate in the particular social or recreational work planned. This limitation threatens success from the start, since others, not in need of diversions, have to be pressed into service to save it from failure; and then the whole undertaking becomes artificial. Furthermore, such restricted activities serve to divide the general social life of a community according to sectarian interests. This intensifying of denominational demarcations is conducive to a narrow social outlook and in the end tends to weaken community solidarity. The school, on the other hand, has an advantage over the church as a center for recreational life, both because of its numbers and its inclusiveness; for pupils associate on a common basis of equality, artificial barriers are levelled, and sympathies are broadened.

Another objection to the assumption of extensive social work by churches is that they do not usually carry it on so thoroughly and effectively as specialized institutions. This is partly because they rely on voluntary, untrained, and often unenthusiastic workers; but more especially because their social activities are undertaken for ulterior motives and not as ends in themselves. They are selected, therefore, for their utility in attracting young people, rather than for any intrinsic merit. Moreover, if a particular line of work fails to yield expected results, or if leaders for it are not available, it is likely to be omitted temporarily. Such a situation is conducive to slackness and inefficiency; and the results do not bear comparison with social work carried on by trained experts, who are concerned solely with the benefits of the activities themselves. On the whole, as communities develop, so that a variety of institutions are available, the specialized social and recreational organizations, whether connected with the schools or not, will inevitably prove superior to the churches for the conduct of social activities.

The foregoing observations apply to the problems of repre-

sentative churches in fairly normal neighborhoods. In neighborhoods which lack the other social institutions, or are without adequate facilities for wholesome social life, the problem is quite different. Then certainly it would become one of the natural tasks of the church to supply those deficiencies to the best of its ability. These abnormal conditions are usually to be found in the poorer districts of our larger cities; and churches situated in such neighborhoods have acted wisely in enlarging their facilities to assist in social as well as spiritual regeneration.

In rural districts, also, where specialized institutions are often lacking, the church should stand ready to extend the range of its activities and utilize its plant to fill any gap in social life which may occur. The problem there is a practical one of obtaining as many benefits as possible for the community from the few institutions which do exist. The effectiveness of the church will usually depend upon the extent to which a community is united in religious belief. Usually, if there are many small churches with intense sectarian feeling, no one of them will be strong enough to make its activities meet the needs of the entire community; and the community will profit less than it would if one dominating church united the majority of the people.

The Value of Denominational Churches as Compared with a Community Church. This discussion brings us again to the subject of church divisions and church unity. Is the community best served by many rival organizations, representing a variety of religious beliefs? Or is the ideal of the community church, to ignore detailed differences and unite all in common public worship, the more rational? Denominations are largely survivals of the time when minor differences of creed were magnified into absolute essentials of salvation. Each denomination represented itself to be the only perfect channel of religious truth, and considered all other denominations subject to more or less serious error. But this uncompromising attitude is gradually passing away. Religious bodies have made enormous strides towards emphasizing the essentials wherein they are similar, and ignoring the unessen-

tials wherein they differ. So the original motive for the establishment of denominations is no longer a sufficient excuse for their continuance.

Nevertheless, there are advantages still to be found in the existence of a variety of religious bodies. Denominations offer opportunity for the expression of natural individual differences in religious beliefs; and they permit a choice in the forms of religious worship. They also make it possible for groups of comparatively congenial persons to associate in the form of organization which suits best their mental attainments and their social tastes, and for each group to select a leader who satisfies its own particular requirements, though he might not be acceptable to all members of a community.

The advantages arising out of a variety of religious bodies are greatest, and the disadvantages are least, in large communities with varied populations. The unwholesome effects appear in communities which are too small to support many churches adequately. Then the religious members of the community are separated into small groups none to friendly towards one another, and the resources available for religious support are so divided up that no church has the means either to engage a strong leader or to do effective community work. Furthermore, under these circumstances, competition arises, and differences, rather than similarities, are likely to be emphasized. All this tends to concentrate attention upon minor points of doctrine rather than upon the fundamentals of religious belief. The whole religious tone of the community is lowered. Then the union of all the religious resources of the community into one church would be much more effective from the religious point of view; and from the social point of view it would contribute to the solidarity of the whole population.

Many religious people seem to believe that, in as much as churches are beneficent, an oversupply would be impossible. But the existence of too many churches is a source of weakness rather than strength, and gives rise to serious problems. The overchurching of small communities has come about largely as a result of the selfish and uncompromising attitudes of the various denominations. Each sect, believing its faith to

be the only true one, is convinced that nothing but good can come from the establishment of one of its churches in any community, however small. Consequently, whenever a nucleus of followers is to be found, they demonstrate their vitality and their power by starting a new organization, even though it cannot be self-supporting and will, moreover, weaken the churches already in the field.

The normal method of church expansion in a community would be, after one church was established, to wait before starting another until the population had grown so large or so heterogeneous that the first organization seemed incapable of serving the needs of the community. Then another organization should be started; and the new church might well be of a different denomination, if the character of the population warranted it; though a movement to organize a church of a new denomination should originate with the community itself, and not with a distant body of officials unacquainted with local conditions and inspired primarily with the desire to see their own denomination expand. A single community church would normally expand only in response to the real need for new units; but, where the local situation is complicated by the presence of several competing national denominations, the members of the community are likely to overdo church building and force division and competition among the people. If denominations already established are unable to unite to carry on local work, they ought at least to show a spirit of compromise and coöperation in the matter of extending church units into new territory.

The exact size which a church should attain before it should divide, or before a new organization should be started, cannot of course be determined exactly, because this would differ according to the compactness of the settlement and its facilities of communication, and also according to the character of the population. But the results both of statistical studies and of observation indicate that very small churches are less attractive to newcomers in a community, and less efficient in their work, than large churches. Therefore, just so long as people are able to work together harmoniously in one organi-

zation, they should hesitate to establish a new and inevitably weaker organization.

The idea of a single community church, so long as it is adequate to accommodate the population, is an attractive one. It consolidates both workers and financial resources into one unit, and this always makes for strength. Ample financial resources permit the employment of an able pastor and provide effective equipment. The union of the church-going members of the community into one organization also makes possible a fairly satisfactory conduct of social and philanthropic work. It is a church of this kind only which can be made a real community center. But such an organization to be successful requires for its membership a superior class of people. Ability to subordinate minor differences and unite in labor for the larger good is a rare characteristic. In fact a community church requires such a manifestation of the religious spirit as would probably make it quite impracticable for many communities.

Summary and Conclusion. An impartial estimate of the value of the church as a social institution would give it a place of fundamental importance in the life of the community. And an appraisement of its actual achievements would show that it is a potent force. Nevertheless, as is the case with all social institutions, in the church, too, defects are apparent and criticisms of it are numerous. Many of these defects are difficult to correct because they are really related to the character of religion itself. They are not ordinarily due either to corruption, or to selfishness on the part of the leaders, nor are they traceable to outside interference, nor to venal control; although of course isolated instances of all these abuses may be found.

The chief criticism of the clergy is that its personnel does not include so many men of first rate ability as it should. Probably the number is relatively less than in the other professions. Such as they are, the most frequent faults to be found among them are failure to grasp and to follow the essential principles of religion, a natural conservatism, and inability to adjust themselves to new and changing conditions.

The ideal of the church is to elevate the minds of its members above material things towards spiritual values; and religious organizations have experienced their most conspicuous periods of failure when they have departed from this ideal, either by becoming materialistic, or by substituting other activities for religious training in the hope of attaining popularity. Even in the present so-called materialistic age, no clergyman fails because of his high spiritual attainment, but rather because of his deficiencies in ideals and in comprehension of spiritual values. The weakness in the personnel of the clergy, which is a fundamental defect and is always recurring in the history of the church, could be gradually overcome by a more careful selection of candidates for the ministry, and also by the provision of a wiser course of training to fit them for their peculiar task—a course based on a clearer comprehension of the real needs and desires of the people.

As for the conservatism of the church, that is due partly to the character of religious belief and partly to the inertia of human nature. Religious beliefs are supposed to be unchanging; and religious leaders find it much easier to continue to teach the customary dogmas than to introduce innovations in the exposition of truth. But the inevitable result is that church theology lags behind, and comes to be out of harmony with the teachings of other institutions. Radical leaders often try to make old dogmas popular by changing the character of the religious services. They are even willing to hire a brass band or stage a vaudeville performance to attract an audience. But this is not the kind of progressiveness which the situation demands. Religious progressiveness would better be demonstrated by imitating the methods of the medical profession than those of business firms. The reputable physician does not show his worth by advertising, nor by making a blatant display of his successes. He gains respect and patronage rather through discarding antiquated and superstitious methods of healing, and by adopting the latest discoveries of science. Similarly, the church should demonstrate its modernism not by sensational appeals, but by eliminating antiquated superstitions and the unessentials of dogmatic belief, and by pre-

senting the real essentials of religion in a form which shall harmonize with modern thought. Modernism in religious doctrines is not an adjustment which can be accomplished once for all; but it must be a continuous process of making new adaptations, if the churches are to keep pace with the advance of other institutions. Adjustment does not call for a surrender of principles, nor for a departure from religious ideals; it necessitates rather the acquiring of new vehicles for presenting eternal truths.

In its battle against conservatism of thought, the church needs to exercise constant vigilance also against the dangers of stagnation through formalism. While the church may find signal utility in the use of ceremonies and rituals, it should remember that these are aids to, and not ends of, religious worship. Stagnation comes when the spirit and purpose of an organization is lost in the performance of external acts.

Although in general the faults of the churches are serious and widespread, it must be admitted that many of the more progressive churches have realized the situation and have already made gratifying progress towards reasonable adjustments. Those who do lag behind are held back as much by the narrow-mindedness of their congregations as by the conservatism of their leaders. Furthermore, in justice to the churches it should be said that not all the blame for their lack of success is attributable to their own shortcomings. They receive less support from the community as a whole than they deserve, considering the effort they make and the results they actually accomplish. They are too generally regarded as private institutions, organized wholly for the pleasure or profit of their members, rather than as necessary social organizations laboring for the upbuilding of the community. They have received their full share of criticism; but, after all, every social institution has a very definite interdependent relation to the community it is supposed to serve. When one does not function successfully, its failure is quite as likely to be due to unresponsiveness on the part of the people as to defects in the organization itself. Many of the weaknesses of the church

would disappear if they received better financial support and more active coöperation from the people as a whole.

If the church is to achieve its high mission, not only does the institution itself need internal reforms, but radical improvements are needed also in other institutions, notably in the family. Just so long as the family continues to be lax in the early training of children, the church will be unable to carry on its religious work successfully. The two are mutually interdependent. The family is the basic institution upon which the church rests, and, on the other hand, the church itself is looked up to as the chief agent for preserving high standards of family life.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What in your opinion do churches contribute to the life of the community?
2. Find out the number of churches in your city, and the average attendance. What per cent. of the total population is this?
3. Why in your opinion do so few people go to church regularly?
4. Do you consider large churches or small churches the more attractive?
5. Are more churches needed in your community, or would it be better off with fewer churches?
6. Investigate the work of one church in your community, and report all of its activities.
7. What effect will the radio have upon the church?
8. What do you think the churches could do to attract a larger number of people?
9. Do you believe the Russians will be able to abolish the organization of the church?
10. Do you think it would be possible for all denominations to unite into one church? Do you think it would be desirable?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

CURTIS, HENRY S., *Play and Recreation,* Chapter 16.
HOLT, ARTHUR E., "Religion," *American Journal of Sociology,* May, 1929.

JONES, THOMAS J., *Essentials of Civilization,* Chapter 5.
STEINER, JESSE F., *Community Organization,* Chapter 13.
STELZE, CHARLES, "Is the Church Slipping, and Why?" *World's Work,* September, 1927.
TAYLOR, CARL C., *Rural Sociology,* Chapter 10.

CHAPTER XIV

ASSOCIATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF SCIENCE AND ART

I. ASSOCIATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF SCIENCE

In addition to the fundamental social institutions already discussed, there are minor organizations for the cultivation of science and art which deserve mention. Associations for scientific research and those for the development and enjoyment of various forms of art have many points in common; but they differ in so many respects that they may advantageously be treated separately. Scientific organizations will be considered first.

The Benefits of Scientific Knowledge. In this discussion the term science will be used in the broadest sense to include organized bodies of knowledge of all kinds, instead of being confined to the narrower sphere of the so-called natural sciences. In this sense scientific associations would include all organizations of any kind whatsoever that have for their aim the advancement of human knowledge. The desirability of discovering new truths and disseminating them widely is evident enough; but there are certain benefits arising from increased knowledge that deserve special consideration. These benefits are so vast that no detailed account of them will be attempted here; but it will be possible to indicate some of the effects of the new discoveries, and illustrations from the natural sciences will be the most suggestive.

The most practical result of all scientific knowledge is that it teaches us to do things, and to do them quickly and efficiently. It is our knowledge of physical laws which enables us to construct buildings, to perfect means of transportation, to provide lighting and heating for our houses, and to make

other provisions which permit large populations to live in dense groups. Knowledge of chemical and biological laws permits us to produce food and other essentials for the support of the population. Knowledge of these same sciences, directed into other fields, makes it possible for us to cure diseases, to control the spread of epidemics, and to promote physical efficiency. A fuller comprehension of the laws of psychology and sociology will help us to promote the happiness and improve the social relationships of the individuals living in dense groups. Thus the natural sciences make life possible, and the social sciences make life worth while.

The effects of increase in human knowledge will be appreciated by any careful student of history, if he compares the modes of life of one age with those of another. The extraordinary improvements which have been effected in modern living conditions over those of primitive men have coincided at least with increase in human knowledge. During periods in which science has made rapid strides, as it has in the last hundred years, the whole social organization has been transformed; but during periods in which knowledge was at a standstill, or at most made only slight gains, modes of life remained much the same.

Social conditions may, to be sure, change gradually from other causes not started by human effort. Populations may be decimated by pestilences, or exterminated through warfare; and cities may be buried by volcanic eruptions. Migrations may transform the character of populations, and conquests may modify their social relationships. Changes such as these occur without any extension of knowledge; but fundamental improvements in the physical conditions of life are achieved only through the development of science. The increase in knowledge may not come from the schools, nor from any organized attempt at research. Much valuable knowledge is the result of chance discovery, or it is an imperceptible accumulation acquired with no clear understanding of exact sources. But, in one way or another, new knowledge does become available before progress can be made.

When we consider the part which new discoveries of truth

have played in human affairs, we are almost led to believe that we have found the basic cause of human progress; and all that is needed to direct progress at will is to cultivate the sciences. This may, indeed, be the correct view to take in the twentieth century; but, looking far back into history, we realize that knowledge does not grow spontaneously and regularly. There are long intervals of darkness, indicating that its growth is dependent upon still more fundamental factors; and that it cannot, therefore, be the sole cause of progress.

Does Science Contribute to Well-being? We have been speaking of the changes resulting from the advance of knowledge as progress; and by progress we mean a definite gain or improvement in social conditions and in general well-being. Yet there are writers who maintain with considerable plausibility that the changes resulting from the growth of knowledge, which we call civilization, do not indicate progress in the true sense of the word. Life has, they admit, become more complex and wealth has increased enormously; but, they maintain, people have not become any happier, nor any better off, for all the new discoveries and efforts. The problems of living and of the pursuit of happiness are as difficult as ever. Indeed, the multiplication of material goods has tended rather to divert attention from the essentials of life, and has made satisfactory living more difficult than formerly.

This contention touches upon intricate philosophical problems of what really constitutes progress, and of what the standards are for measuring well-being at different epochs. These problems cannot be discussed in detail here; but they should be mentioned, because, if increased knowledge merely alters social life without bringing any real gain to human beings, obviously we do not need to become agitated over the urgency of developing the sciences. Is it possible that we are on the wrong track? Perhaps we should be better off if we left the sciences to shift for themselves and devoted our energies to moral philosophy and the cultivation of the virtues. The latter course would undoubtedly be profitable, but is the promotion of the sciences a mistake? The sciences are cultivated usually with little consideration for ultimate effects but

rather for the immediate advantages to be gained by the accomplishment of some special objective. The attitude is that, if we only knew how, we could improve the quality of the soil, we could produce cheaper foods, we could cure a disease, or we could transport passengers through the air. Are we deceived in thinking that these immediately desirable objectives are of no ultimate value? It is hard to bring ourselves to this conclusion.

If we understand civilization to mean merely the attainment of material things, then we might easily be led to condemn it, since true well-being does not consist in possessions. Yet even such a condemnation would show a narrow point of view, for material things do have their place in life, though they do not make up the whole of life. Wealth is not an end but a necessary condition to a well-rounded life. And the facile production of wealth should really free us from the domination of matter, since it helps to provide for our physical comforts with the least possible effort, and therefore ensures us leisure and energy to devote to the cultural interests of life. That we often fail to apply wealth to this end is not the fault of science. The knowledge derived from scientific research provides the opportunities for a superior life, but it does not guarantee its attainment. The further development of knowledge, however, especially in the social sciences, will tend to provide the incentive as well as the means for the attainment of greater well-being. At present, progress in the sciences is one-sided, with emphasis on those which stimulate material development. The need is not for any renunciation of knowledge, but always for an extension of it, and its more uniform development in all fields. With higher ideals and a more intelligent comprehension of all the values of life, new knowledge as it is gained should be utilized to increase immeasurably both material well-being and happiness. We must conclude, therefore, that, although knowledge may be perverted to our detriment, its possibilities for good warrant its cultivation with the greatest solicitude and zeal.

Existing Organizations for the Advancement of Science. The rapid advancement of science in recent years indi-

cates that the underlying conditions are favorable to its cultivation. But we are confronted with the question of whether our present facilities for research are adequate, and whether the progress that is being made is satisfactory. Should we take more advantage of the favorable conditions and deliberately encourage a more rapid development of the sciences in the hope of hastening the progress of civilization?

At the present time the facilities for the advancement of science are largely connected with universities, where teaching and research are supposed to be carried on together. Other agencies exist, but they have not yet assumed an important rôle. Occasionally an endowment is created for the sole purpose of research, such as the Rockefeller Foundation for Medical Research, or the Russell Sage Foundation. A few organizations, which rely mostly, if not entirely, upon annual contributions, are also devoting themselves wholly to research, such as the National Geographic Society, and the National Bureau of Economic Research. Certain departments of the Federal Government, too, are carrying on extensive investigations and collecting much valuable scientific information.

A few large private business concerns, recognizing the advantage of improvements in methods, have established departments, or laboratories, of research; but these usually confine themselves to the solution of definite problems which have to do with the lowering of costs or improving the quality of their respective products; and, so far as possible, these results are kept secret for private gain instead of being used for the general extension of knowledge.

Stimulus is also given to scientific progress by the organization of the scientists in the various fields into national associations. The members are, to be sure, for the most part teachers also; but the object of these organizations is the advancement of science rather than the improvement of teaching. Their annual meetings are for the purpose of reporting progress in research and of engaging in mutual discussion, rather than for actually carrying on investigations. But these associations often do some active work in mapping out or

suggesting lines of research, and in appointing committees to report upon particular topics.

Recently the cause of scientific progress has been greatly aided by the establishment of research fellowships to give financial support to investigators who seem to be working on promising subjects, but who lack the time or the resources to carry them on effectively without aid. Indirect assistance also is given to the advancement of science by the establishment of fellowships in universities to provide means of study, either at home or abroad, and which have for their primary object the training of men for scientific research.

Mention should also be made of the fact that much of our research and discovery, especially in practical fields, is not accomplished by organizations at all, but by private individuals working with their own personal funds. Names such as Edison, Burbank, and the Wrights are sufficient to suggest the results achieved in this way.

The Suitability of Universities as Places for Scientific Research. After all due allowance is made for the work of the various endowments and associations for the advancement of science, we are brought back to our original statement that most of our research is carried on by men connected with universities, who are engaged primarily in the instruction of students. We have, therefore, to consider the adequacy of this system of promoting scientific investigation. Can the advancement of science be safely left to universities such as they are now, or should further measures be taken for the extension of research and the utilization of the results obtained? To answer this question we must first ascertain what are the actual advantages and disadvantages of tying up scientific research with the work of instruction in the higher institutions of learning.

In favor of the system, it may be said that the universities are appropriate institutions for the conduct of research, in as much as they already possess the libraries, the laboratories, and other equipment needed for work of this kind. Furthermore, the faculties of universities are engaged in teaching the most advanced phases of the various sciences. They are, so

to speak, working on the borderland of new and tempting regions of knowledge; and they are likely, therefore, to be acquainted with favorable possibilities for research, and to be interested in extending the bounds of knowledge. It is, moreover, commonly argued that the work of research and the work of instruction ought to be carried on together by the same persons for the advantage both of teachers and of pupils. Teachers who are engaged in research problems are supposed to be on that account more alert and inspiring; and advanced students, brought face to face with problems in the process of solution, are supposed to be animated with keener interest and enthusiasm. Moreover, in many cases students should be able to assist in working out the details of problems. These arguments are forceful; and they have been generally accepted as based on sound methods, at least as far as advanced lines of instruction are concerned. But there still remains a question of whether this system always promotes the best interests of science.

The system of combining scientific research with teaching does have several disadvantages, which are more evident now than they were formerly when teachers had fewer students and fewer encroachments upon their time. The recent growth in the size of universities has made the demand for instruction more pressing and more exacting than ever before. The average university teacher now has large classes and many of them; and, if he devotes any attention to the needs of individual students, his time is fully occupied; and he could not add the task of research without seriously encroaching upon his work of instruction. Those who are able to accomplish the two tasks efficiently are exceptional rather than average university men, and cannot be taken as the standard in the formulation of a system. The work of extending knowledge is of too great social importance to be entrusted to persons already occupied with other duties.

Another objection to the combination of teaching and research is that the mental characteristics required for the two pursuits are not the same; and it is a mistake to assume that both kinds of characteristics always appear in the same in-

dividual. A successful teacher needs to possess logical powers of thought for arranging material, and aptitude for clear exposition; but above all he must be able to understand the point of view of beginners, and to appreciate their difficulties. The scientist, on the other hand, must possess originality, resourcefulness, and strong powers of concentration. His attention should be absorbed by the most advanced and complicated phases of his subject, rather than concerned with the problems of teaching elementary principles. An excellent teacher may, therefore, be an indifferent scientist, and a successful scientist may make a poor instructor. It is a rare occurrence to find all these various qualities combined in the same person.

It seems evident that, under the conditions prevailing in our large universities, the work both of instruction and of research would be advanced if at least a partial division of labor were effected between teachers and scientists. Those who show an aptitude for instruction should be encouraged to perfect themselves for that vocation, while those who display ability for research should be relieved of a large part of the routine duties connected with teaching. They could still give lectures connected with their researches, or direct advanced students in their special fields; but most of their time should be free to devote to the advancement of science. It would be ridiculous to require an Edison to spend most of his day in teaching and in correcting papers, before he could enter his laboratory to conduct experiments.

The present position taken by most of our universities is anomalous. The chief work of the faculty is obviously that of teaching, yet strangely enough the universities do not often recognize ability in this line as a cause of advancement. Standards for promotion are based rather on achievements in research. Yet faculty members who show aptitude for research, though their talent is recognized, are given little assistance in making use of it. They are required to earn their living by devoting a full time working period to the exacting, and perhaps to them distasteful, work of teaching; and they are permitted to engage in research only in the leisure time remaining after their regular duties are performed. In other

words, university requirements for work are in one field, and their standards for judgment and for recognition are in another. Probably there is no other occupation in which the estimate of a man's ability is not based upon the kind of work which he is primarily engaged to perform.

More Adequate Support is Needed for Scientific Research. If the task of advancing human knowledge is to be left chiefly to the universities, then more adequate financial provision should be made for this work, because it deserves much more active support than it now receives. The partial division of labor suggested, between teachers and research workers, cannot be made very effective unless endowments are given for the express purpose of promoting research, because the demand for instruction is now so pressing that few universities can afford to permit members of their staffs to engage in research alone.

Endowments are needed also for the establishment of more separate institutions for research, for these are preferable in some cases. In them administrators and investigators would be unhampered by other duties, and would be free to devote their undivided attention to their chosen subjects. They would also be free to select their locations; and, for certain kinds of investigation, such as making astronomical observations, this would be an advantage. Their books and scientific apparatus could be selected for their specialized work and made always available to the individual worker.

Nevertheless, in many ways the specialized research institution is inferior to the university, and is usually more expensive, for this type of work. Universities not only have a plant already established, with laboratories and libraries; but they have corps of advanced students and instructors, many of whom could be utilized without extra expense as assistants and collaborators in conducting experiments. Furthermore, since various kinds of investigations need advice and assistance from related departments, this assistance could be obtained much more easily within a university where all the sciences were being taught, than in an independent institution where the workers were specialists in one line only. A further argu-

ment for the utilization of the universities is that, even as working institutions, they would profit greatly by the addition of research departments in their various fields. The conduct of investigations, the contacts of productive scientists one with another, and the presence of specialized advanced students would all help to raise the level of university standards and improve the spirit of university work.

Funds Are Now Often Ineffectively Employed. Undoubtedly one of the most effective methods of stimulating social progress would be to obtain more liberal endowments for scientific research, together with the establishment of special funds for the training of promising scientists. Plenty of wealth exists in the United States, and the spirit is present also to utilize it in public service. Generous endowments would undoubtedly be forthcoming, if the advantages arising from an increase in knowledge were more generally realized. As it is much money intended for the public service is spent in superficial and wasteful ways. Too often it is put into spectacular prizes offered, to be sure, as rewards for achievements which mark a real step forward in progress. This has been notably the case in the field of aviation. If such gifts were, instead, put into endowments which would make possible continued study and experiment, much more would probably be accomplished, for knowledge is often utilized in ways which could never have been foreseen in the first place. Who could have predicted, for instance, all the social results that have followed the perfection of the gasoline engine, or the discovery of the X-ray, or the use of the radio?

Another and perhaps a more serious mistake which is made in the application of surplus funds is that, instead of utilizing them for the discovery of basic laws in the natural or the social sciences, we spend them in the vain hope of advancing human welfare by trying to correct superficial errors, or by improving surface conditions, without sufficient knowledge of fundamental causes. We are generous in our donations to hospitals for the care of the sick, but fail to appreciate the value of laboratories for the investigation and elimination of disease. We give freely for the relief of the needy, but are

little concerned about the abolition of poverty. Funds for the advancement of knowledge will probably have to come first from private individuals, just as in the early days colleges were established by private endowments. Only slowly will legislatures, representing as they do the average of the population, come to recognize the relationship between the progress of knowledge and the general welfare, and be willing to appropriate funds for scientific research.

Problems of the Utilization of Knowledge. Scientific research is, however, only one way of advancing human welfare through the extension of knowledge. The other way is the dissemination of knowledge as it is gained, and its general application to the practical affairs of life. Scientific discoveries are of little use, if they exist merely as laboratory records; and inventions do not add to the comforts of life, if they are never put on the market. The assumption usually is that new truths will be utilized automatically as soon as they are shown to be practicable; but the fact is that in many cases new discoveries are never utilized at all, and in many others adoption lags far behind the discoveries themselves.

It is true that sometimes scientific discoveries, valuable in themselves, have no practical bearing. Their value lies only in their utilization by other branches of knowledge, or in the stimulus they give to further discoveries. But, of those which are immediately practicable, the majority follow the general law that the application lags behind the discovery itself. Delays are traceable to several causes which vary more or less with the type of the discovery. In the first place, utilization of new inventions would naturally be slow because people are generally conservative, if for no other reason. Habits, prejudices, and even superstitions may enter to delay the general adoption of new discoveries. When people have become accustomed to certain methods of acting, they tend to resist change, at least until the superiority of the new system is clearly demonstrated. The force of habit is well illustrated by delay in the adoption of new farming methods, or in the cultivation of a new kind of crop.

Occasionally new systems or principles can be introduced

and operated only by the force of the government itself; so, in democratic countries, where the assent of the majority of the people is required, the process of educating public opinion naturally takes longer than it would if the decision lay with a single executive, as it does in a private corporation.

Sometimes the new knowledge is not applied merely because the benefits it would ensure would not be immediate, or because they are not very apparent. Lack of perception is the real cause of the difficulty of enforcing sanitary measures. The average person will not assume any responsibility for their adoption, because it is hard for him to realize the dangers they would obviate.

Occasionally failure to apply scientific information is merely a question of expense, or of difficulty in administration. For example, we have acquired knowledge which should enable us to resist disease much more effectively than we actually do. We could eliminate flies and mosquitoes; but an effective campaign against them would involve so much labor and expense that many communities defer action indefinitely.

New inventions and new methods are most likely to be utilized promptly in business concerns where they promise a financial profit, or at least the avoidance of loss. But even wealthy corporations sometimes purchase inventions merely to keep them out of the hands of troublesome rivals; and then they shelve them because of the high cost of installation.

Notwithstanding the delays so frequently to be observed in the utilization of material inventions, discoveries in the field of the natural sciences are on the whole much more promptly applied than those in the field of the social sciences, such as psychology, education, or economics. Social theories have so often been advocated before they have been fully worked out and tested, that the public has not the same confidence in their utility they might otherwise have had. Moreover, the nature of social laws is such that it is much more difficult to demonstrate their value than to show the utility of material improvements. Social theories, even when generally accepted by scientists, seem to most people to be merely matters of personal opinion. And the average man, although he

would not presume to maintain his old views and prejudices against a laboratory demonstration of a physical law, insists on his right to his own opinion in the sphere of social laws.

Another serious impediment to the spread of social theories is that they often become subjects of party controversy; and, when this occurs, no kind of demonstration of their truth suffices to convince the organized opposition. If new theories come to be adopted by a strong party in power, they may be given a trial; but if they are advocated by a weak party they never have any opportunity for demonstration. This danger is not entirely confined to the social sciences, for it has already penetrated the biological field and may even yet extend to some of the natural sciences. So far, however, natural laws, which are capable of laboratory demonstration, have not become subjects of party division to be fought over in the political arena.

Different Types of Discoveries Require Different Means of Utilization. Prompt utilization of newly discovered scientific truths is so important a phase of the general process of human enlightenment that it should be made a matter of conscious planning, instead of being left a mere sport of chance. But efficacious methods of propaganda differ with the type of the discoveries, and these discoveries may be conveniently divided into three classes. First, there are the material inventions which may be sold upon the market, like household implements, or machines to be used in farming or in industry. Secondly, there are new methods or processes intended for individual use but not marketable like a commodity, such as an accounting system, or a new method of farm cultivation. Thirdly, there are discoveries which the political organization can use for the good of the people as a whole, like hygienic measures, or a new method of highway construction.

The first class of inventions need not be discussed, because private business concerns may be relied upon to adopt the promising ones and to advertise their use from motives of profit. The chief social problem connected with this type of invention is that the price of the article, especially if it is

patented, may be made so high that many people who need it most will be unable to purchase it.

The other classes of discoveries do need definite plans for organized propaganda. The second group, concerned with methods or processes, needs the assistance of some special organization to disseminate information. The United States Department of Agriculture and agricultural colleges are making available information about the latest improvements in farming methods; and their work is a model of what might be done in other lines. In a similar way, schools of business administration are helping to introduce among business concerns the most approved methods in such fields as marketing and advertising. Trade journals have become important agents for disseminating economic and financial information. It might be expected that competing business firms would eagerly seek and rapidly adopt new and efficient business methods; but here, as in other departments of social life, habit and sometimes prejudice are strong restraining forces. It often takes time and persistent effort to introduce new systems, even when increased profit is to be derived from them.

The third type of improvement, since it concerns expenditure of effort or of money for the general welfare, or perhaps for the welfare of a particular class or a special section of the country, is the most difficult to introduce, because no immediate personal profit is in view and the gain seems so intangible. Here, as in the preceding case, organized assistance is needed. An educational institution, or perhaps a philanthropic organization, may be the originator of the system and the center of propaganda; but all the various channels available for the formation of public opinion, such as the press and the lecture platform, must be employed to win popular support. It may not be necessary to secure the active support of a majority of the people for a social reform before it is introduced. New measures can be introduced into a municipality or into a public institution, if the officials and those closely connected with the enterprise favor it and the majority are neutral; but, if the majority are actively opposed or resistant

to the undertaking, it will certainly fail. Introduction of advanced measures for the general welfare indicates the presence of a strong civic consciousness and the attainment of a high stage of civilization. If a community wants to earn a high place among other communities for progress and enlightenment, effort should be made to popularize discussions of social problems in order to facilitate reforms.

Conclusion. In order then to derive the greatest benefit from discoveries and inventions, organized methods of disseminating information are as necessary as organized systems for discovering truth in the first place. The two should develop together in order that society may profit as rapidly as possible from the results of research. The fact that the adaptation of new methods normally lags behind their discovery should not, however, deter us from exerting every effort to extend the bounds of knowledge. The more rapid the discoveries, the more accustomed people will become to change, and the less formidable will be the resistance of habit.

The advancement of science is dependent more directly upon the efficiency of the schools than upon any other social institution; but adequate support of research, like that of all other social undertakings, is ultimately dependent upon economic prosperity. The schools, therefore, have a twofold duty to perform: to raise the present level of social life through intellectual training and the dissemination of knowledge; and to expedite progress by adding to the sum of human knowledge. The second function shows less development than the first; and, if more encouragement were given to it, social progress would be more rapid and continuous.

II. ASSOCIATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF ART

While art resembles science in that it is one of the higher mental products, it differs materially from it in that it is used in the first instance for pleasure and diversion, though ultimately it influences education and progress. Also various forms of art, such as architecture, music, literature, and painting differ so greatly one from another that organizations for

their promotion and cultivation show a wide diversity both in purposes and methods. Some, like musical associations, are self-supporting, because the pleasure they afford has such a wide appeal; while others, such as museums for painting and sculpture, have to rely almost wholly upon public support.

The Purposes of Art. Although art is cultivated ordinarily for the pleasure it affords, from the social point of view art is not primarily recreative in its nature; rather is it educational, though its appeal is to the emotions instead of to the intellect. Not only do the arts offer enjoyment to the individual, but artistic products and artistic surroundings have a strong formative influence upon personality. This influence may be perceived by contrasting the impression which a beautiful town or city makes compared with an ugly one, or by contrasting the personalities of those long accustomed to artistic surroundings with those who have been denied such privileges. Education in the fine arts, though it is difficult to distinguish in effect from any other kind of education, such as scientific education or purely intellectual training, does give to individuals and to peoples an indefinable quality usually termed culture. The reason for fostering art in a community, therefore, is not merely for the immediate enjoyment which it provides, but also for the ultimate impression it makes upon the character of the people.

Existing Associations for the Promotion of Art. Sources of artistic influence are so numerous that only representative ones can be mentioned here. Museums which specialize chiefly in painting and sculpture are perhaps the most formal of these organizations; and they are used for study and training as well as enjoyment. In many cities these museums appeal merely to the few who have already had esthetic training; but they can be made very active agents both for the education and the entertainment of the mass of the people, as is the case with the recently established Cleveland museum. In addition to the customary duties of collecting art products, this museum coöperates with the public schools to train the pupils in appreciation of art. Classes from the schools meet at the museum once a week to hear informal

talks on works of art and to receive instruction in drawing. In 1928, over 48,000 children and 25,000 adults attended the various classes and entertainments. The museum coöperates also with the Public Library in giving exhibitions of various kinds from its more portable collections. It also engages competent instructors to give informal talks both to children and to adults on different phases of art. Those on week days are given chiefly for the benefit of art students; and those on Sundays for the general public, which attends in large numbers. Finally, this museum is branching out to develop appreciation of music, and holds each year several series of concerts with varied programs. An organ has been installed in its auditorium; and recitals are given Sunday afternoons, and frequently on Wednesdays and Fridays as well.

Music and drama are the arts with the most popular appeal, and organizations for their promotion are the most common and varied of all. In American, as well as in European, cities music of real merit is now given by operatic companies and by symphony orchestras. The movement to cultivate appreciation of music is progressing rapidly. Instruction in singing is given more and more extensively in the public schools. Singing classes are being organized both for children and adults; and community singing is being introduced in many places as a popular form of entertainment. Opportunities for the enjoyment of theatrical entertainments are being extended. This is shown not merely in the growth of moving picture productions, but in the popularization of the legitimate drama. Community theatres and "little theatres," which are rapidly multiplying, are attempting in their performances to popularize the work both of professional and semi-professional actors. Performances given by amateurs alone have become very common also, both in educational institutions and in the community at large. All these forms have contributed to artistic appreciation and to popular entertainment.

Literature in its varied forms, though not the work of associated effort, should also be mentioned as one of the most important sources of esthetic education and of enjoyment. By means of associated effort, however, books are made available

free of cost in our public libraries; and guidance in choice of reading is being extended through book reviews, book clubs, and specialized library attendants.

The Educative Value of an Esthetic Environment. Besides the educative influence of the commonly recognized products of the fine arts, there are other influences, more subtle, which make a continuous impression upon human character, such as those which emanate from esthetic surroundings in general. The value, for instance, of living in a beautiful city is subtly pervasive, though this has been too little realized in the past. Appreciation of the constructive value of beauty has come about largely, perhaps, through a belated public realization of the demoralizing effects of squalid surroundings, which are often allowed to continue because no one has the initiative to start improvements. At last concerted effort for reform is being made. Since the beauty of a city, even as its utility, often depends largely upon its general plan, city planning is developing as a special art, and is bound to be of inestimable value in producing a favorable setting both for civic beauty and at the same time for general civic welfare. Wide avenues, open spaces, long vistas, and parks not only have esthetic value but contribute to health and comfort as well.

If a good general plan is the primary esthetic need of a city, hardly less important to its general attractiveness is the architectural merit of its buildings. Though they must be planned for utility, they should be designed for beauty as well. Furthermore, architectural beauty, especially in homes and school buildings, carves its impression deep, because with them association is so intimate and continuous, especially during the formative years. Although the child is unconscious of the process, structure, form, decoration and color combinations in the environment are forming his esthetic standards. Even as harmony of sound is important to the ear, so is harmony of color important to the eye. Children brought up in artistic home surroundings gain an esthetic perception never lost in later years.

As for civic adornment, even if a city cannot afford the im-

pressiveness of important monuments, there is always a charm to be found in the well-planned use of trees and plants. Furthermore, citizens individually, by care exercised in keeping their own houses and grounds merely trim and neat when they can do no more, help to achieve a cumulative effect of civic beauty and prosperity.

Two Factors in the Development of Art. Although the influences are many and varied which stimulate the development of art, there are two primary factors essential to it. There must be artists and their products, and there must be artistic appreciation. Neither can survive without the other. Artists, their genius developed by training, must take the lead and provide us with objects of beauty; but an appreciation of and demand for artistic products on the part of the people are essential for the support and encouragement of artistic talent. History shows that art has flourished whenever it has been taken under the protection of a strong patron. Under monarchical forms of government that patron was sometimes the church and sometimes the ruler. In democratic states this patronage has to come from the people as a whole, and it will come only as the result of a popular education in the appreciation of art. It is true, of course, that artistic geniuses cannot be produced at will but, under the influence of an intelligent demand, existing talent can be drawn into the artistic field. Talent always tends to follow those activities which are the most deeply appreciated and the most highly rewarded.

The Present Status of Art in the United States. With this review of the different types of art associations, we may next turn to the present status of art in the United States, taking into account both the merit of artistic productions and the general level of artistic education. An unprejudiced estimate of existing conditions must lead to the conclusion that, in this country at least, and in comparison with other periods of history, both artistic products and artistic appreciation are at a low level. This age is preëminently one of industrialism; and intellectual activity in the field of science is much more marked than in that of art. Of all the arts, music, that is as far as execution is concerned, is probably the most highly

developed in the United States; and music is an art which still depends upon existing musical talent for its rendition.

Concerning musical development in the United States, the editor of one of our popular magazines quotes Rachmaninoff as saying:

"American concert audiences are bigger and more appreciative of good music than those in any other country."

And he continues: "Rachmaninoff is not the first musician to comment upon America's musical development during the past twenty years. Paderewski, Casals, and even the crusty old de Pachmann have recently paid tribute to the increasing interest and intelligence that we are bringing to the study and appreciation of music. Our composers are still *ein wenig zuruck* in their symphonic productions, but it is in the field of symphonic production that we take our preëminent position. 'Philadelphia possesses one of the greatest orchestras the world has ever heard,' says Rachmaninoff, who might with nearly as much truth have selected the Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York, the Boston Symphony, or even the excellent Symphony Orchestra of Cleveland. A large part of our musical appreciation is directly due to the splendid civic orchestras maintained in many of our large cities, not only in centers of Eastern culture, but in the smaller cities of the West and South as well—Cincinnati, Minneapolis and Seattle, come first to mind—superbly directed orchestras render programs of the finest music. Rachmaninoff commends what many of us realize with quiet joy—that more music, and better music is being heard in American cities today than anywhere else in the world."

In the field of literature there is an enormous production of printed matter, but few are the achievements of permanent value. Literary products, like industrial products, seem now to be on a commercial basis. Books are constantly being produced which have a ready sale, but which, judged by the standards of art, cater to a popular taste not yet highly educated. The drama is in a similar situation. Painting and sculpture show meagre development, though interest in these arts is on the increase. On the other hand, architecture in

the United States does seem now to be in an active state of development and some of our new buildings display creative genius. Since architecture has such a utilitarian basis, it seems natural that it should flourish in this utilitarian age, and that some of its most pronounced successes should be buildings for commercial use. It is encouraging to remember that, in the great periods of artistic development in the past, architectural achievements have normally preceded those in the fields of painting and sculpture.

The level of artistic appreciation of the people in the United States as a whole is certainly not above, and probably far below, the level of artistic production. Not only is there little demand for artistic products, but there is a widespread toleration of positive ugliness in homes and in communities. Without doubt the ancient Egyptians, the Athenians, and the Italians of the Renaissance period had a higher appreciation of art than modern peoples of the same level of intelligence. It is not unlikely that even the ancient Mayas of Yucatan could enlighten us on the subject of civic art.

Even though most of the fine arts are still relatively undeveloped in this country, indications of an awakening are apparent. High attainment in the interpretation of music, marked activity in the field of literature, and the strength and originality shown in architecture are all signs of a healthy activity. Furthermore, the insistent agitation for city planning, the increasing resistance to the encroachments of commercialism upon the natural beauties of the country and the attractiveness of the city, all indicate a growing demand on the part of the people for esthetic surroundings even at the expense of profit.

The limited achievement in the fine arts in this country, for which it has been criticized by foreign peoples, indicates after all a not unnatural situation, for cultural products are not characteristic of new communities. Americans have been devoting themselves to the conquest of the environment and to economic development, pursuits which are obviously necessary in a newly settled country. A society like an individual provides first for material needs and later for intellectual de-

sires. It would be absurd for frontiersmen to spend their time in developing cultural activities while nature was still unsubdued. Moreover, the very vastness of our natural resources has concentrated our attention on them long after the frontier stage of economic development. We have been using our creative powers in solving problems of large scale production, and we have become experts in economic activities. Our achievement in material values may have delayed achievement of cultural values longer than might otherwise have been expected. But under the most favorable conditions the cycle of social development is a long one and a generation or two counts for little. If the signs of artistic awakening, now in evidence, prove to be permanent, the course of our social progress cannot be said to have been abnormally slow.

Methods of Encouraging Popular Appreciation of Art. The growth of art in all its various branches, even after it has taken root, must necessarily be a gradual one in the United States. The cultivation of a discriminating taste in such an enormous population must take time; and the development of artistic talent cannot be expected to keep far ahead of appreciation, so that it is inevitable that artists of merit will appear but slowly. Nevertheless the outlook seems encouraging. Already there exists the wealth which is the necessary foundation for the encouragement and patronage of art; and, if the demand for artistic products asserts itself, this wealth will begin to be directed towards the promotion and reward of talent. Again, it should be emphasized that art is a delicate plant which thrives only when carefully nurtured, and that both public interest and powerful patronage are essentials to its growth and maturity.

In considering possible measures for improving the status of the fine arts, it should be remembered that art associations do not belong to the class of institutions, such as the family, the state, and the church, which have developed weaknesses that need to be remedied. They resemble rather recreational and scientific organizations which need cultivation and encouragement instead of specific reform. While there are many minor measures which would no doubt help to improve conditions in

the field of art, only the methods fundamental to its promotion need to be considered here.

The best method of stimulating any cultural activity is through education, especially the education of children in the period when they are forming their tastes and ideals. Progress is already being made in cultivating the fine arts in the schools, but unwholesome influences are persisting in our social life, which tend to counteract their beneficent influence. The prevalence of primitive and barbaric types of music, and of crude and sentimental theatrical performances, are continuous influences tending to deprave the taste. Home surroundings, which are of such great importance to children, have as yet shown little improvement in artistic standards; and improvement cannot of course be made by outsiders but must be left largely to the initiative of the families themselves.

Under these circumstances, civic art is all the more important as a channel for popular education, for it can be controlled by leaders with an appreciation of the importance of beauty. Civic art, however, ought to include more than city planning, and should comprise all those public influences which affect the sentiments and the emotions of the people. With such an interpretation of it, control should be exercised over advertising and other commercial and industrial enterprises. And this should be done, not merely from the usually recognized reason that they are liable to mar the appearance of the streets and buildings, but also because of the influence they exert upon the minds of impressionable persons.

Unwholesome influences radiate also from the press, when newspapers report scandals and crimes with sordid realism. The emotional influence of newspapers is similar to that of moving pictures; and both are influential agencies because they reach so many people. Alarm is frequently expressed over the immoral influence of the press, with its tendencies to increase vice and crime through suggestion, but a strong case could be made out against the newspapers on esthetic grounds alone. Their lurid stories tend to suppress or pervert the esthetic tastes to the detriment of the emotional and moral qualities.

The Development of Artistic Talent. The development of artistic talent is also largely a matter of education, though the production of geniuses in any field is a biological phenomenon which remains beyond our powers to control. In a rich country like the United States, the establishment of sufficient schools of art will normally come with the demand for them. But at present most of the great works of art which serve for models and inspiration are located in foreign countries. It would be highly desirable if more travelling fellowships could be established, so that a larger number of promising students might gain the stimulus to be derived from studying foreign art treasures. Even though training in the technique of painting or of sculpture could be obtained through instructors in this country, direct personal study of the great works of architecture, sculpture and painting to be found in the old world would add an invaluable element to artistic training.

In addition to formal training artists need the support of public interest and intelligent criticism. In the past, stimulus has resulted often from competitions for the production of public monuments. These competitions have seemed to bring out the best efforts of the competing artists; and they do not have the objectionable feature of discouraging the losers, since all worthy products may be utilized in one way or another even when they fail to receive the highest award. These measures of course imply an active interest and demand for art on the part of the people; and therefore the general education of the public and the special training of artists must proceed together.

Conclusion. While science has displayed healthy activity in the United States, the fine arts show a relatively slow development. Along certain lines, to be sure, particularly in music and architecture, progress is encouraging; but, on the whole, the condition of the fine arts calls for active measures of stimulation. The further development of artistic products and of artistic appreciation in this country will help to educate the emotional life, and will also furnish its people a source of continuous enjoyment. Art is so closely allied with pleas-

ure and recreation that its growth cannot fail to raise the tone of those passive forms of recreation so generally sought by the majority. In discussing the value of scientific discoveries, we came to the conclusion that knowledge acted as a means towards an end. Art, however, is both a means and an end. The individual is likely to regard it as a source of pleasure and relaxation; but, from a social point of view, it is a means of culture and an agent in improving the general quality of social life.

The development of art, like that of science, is dependent upon educational facilities and is ultimately influenced by prosperous economic conditions. For the production of both scientists and artists, advanced educational institutions are required; but cultivation of appreciation of art should be begun in the lowest grades of school, or if possible before school age. Both science and art are fundamental factors in the attainment of a high stage of civilization, and both should receive deliberate encouragement and support.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Make a list of six important products which have resulted from new scientific discoveries. Do you think the cost of gaining the knowledge was large compared with the benefits obtained?
2. Is there a museum of art, or of natural history, in your city? Do you attend them? If so, what benefits do you receive?
3. Ascertain what measures such institutions are taking to educate the people.
4. Report on the measures the Public Library is taking to interest and educate the citizens.
5. In what ways could the Library extend its usefulness?
6. Do you consider the city in which you live a beautiful one? Make a list of the beautiful features and of the ugly features.
7. Will the radio decrease the demand for public concerts? For musicians? Will it increase or decrease the popular demand for good music?

8. Which has developed most in the United States, science or art? Discuss.
9. What measures would advance scientific knowledge in this country? Would you use similar or different measures to encourage art?
10. Why are patents and copyrights granted by the government? Do you think they serve their purpose?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Cleveland Recreational Survey, "Sphere of Private Agencies," Chapter 9.

Groves, Ernest R., *An Introduction to Sociology,* Chapters 26 and 27.

Hertzler, Joyce O., *Social Progress,* Chapters 10 and 24.

Jones, Thomas J., *Essentials of Civilization,* Chapter 7.

Taylor, Carl C., *Rural Sociology,* Chapter 17.

Zeublin, Charles, *American Municipal Progress,* Chapter 17.

CHAPTER XV

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

We have now reviewed the various temporary forms of association and have examined the nature and the functions of the most important permanent institutions. It remains to consider their relationships to one another and to society as a whole.

The Complexity of Social Relationships. Although it is obviously necessary to study the different institutions as independent organizations, in doing so the student is likely to lose a sense of the unity of society, and to overlook the close interrelationships of the various social institutions and of the individuals composing them. In an attempt to avoid this danger, the close relationship existing between similar institutions has already been continuously stressed in previous chapters; and in this final review it will again be emphasized. The student should make an effort to appreciate this unity of society and interdependence of social groups. He should realize that not only are social institutions not self-sufficing entities, but that an individual is not a different person as a citizen of a state, as a member of a church, or as a productive worker, but that into all his social relations he brings his own special attitudes and prejudices.

But the idea of interrelationship must be carried even further than this, or the student will still be left with a one-sided and erroneous view of social relationships. The individual cannot be regarded as a rigid and unchanging personality, merely impressing his individuality upon other individuals and associations. He has of course been largely formed himself by their influence, and he continues to be modified by them. In fact every organization with which he is connected makes such an immediate imprint upon his personality that

he may appear to be really different as he is in turn an employer of labor, a church warden, or a member of a social club. The true situation, which is difficult to appreciate in details, is that every individual, as a unit of society, impresses his personality upon other units and upon social organizations, and is in turn impressed and fashioned by them.

Because of this interdependence, as has already been pointed out, defects in a social institution may not always have their origin there, but may be traceable to other institutions or even ultimately to individual depravity. For example, defects in the state were found to be attributable partly to faults in the economic system. Miscarriages in the department of justice could be traced directly to defects in the political organization. And abuses in any institution might in the last resort be attributed to weaknesses in human nature. If, finally, we try to explain causes of perversion of character, we must naturally turn to the institutions of a more cultural and ethical order. In the case of an individual of anti-social character, we shall have to ask if he has received a proper education, and if the church has exercised a strong moral influence over him. We may find that his education was limited to the required minimum, and that his contact with the church was only of the most casual kind. Then, if we turn to the family to see if it has exerted wholesome early influences, we may find that it was incompetent and either neglected the child or even, perhaps, exerted vicious influences over him. If, however, we should conclude from a survey of the institution of the family that it was the original source of all social evils because it failed to train character, we should again be seriously misled. The situation is not so simple. A picture of society in which the family appears to be the basic institution, because it makes the first impression upon the character of the young, and because other institutions seem to grow out of it like branches from the trunk of a tree, is an attractive one. It does contain a measure of truth, but it is entirely inadequate to portray all the facts. If we push our investigation further and ask why the family is incompetent, we shall find plenty of reasons in the shortcomings of other institutions. Perhaps

the father of a family works faithfully when he has employment, but through no fault of his own he can find work only intermittently. Possibly all the adults in the family work, and still the total income is so small that their attention has to be devoted entirely to obtaining material things. Then the children have little chance for mental or moral training at home. Furthermore, the community may not provide for the children any wholesome opportunities for recreation, so that only in the streets can they find room for play. Perhaps the political organization permits the family to live in demoralizing conditions, without, for instance, safeguarding its health by the enforcement of sanitary regulations. Even the state department of justice may share in the responsibility of the disintegration of a family by dealing out injustice; and reformatory institutions may complete its demoralization.

Although these possibilities indicate extreme rather than average conditions, they serve to illustrate how far from self-sufficing any one social organization is. Although each is supposed to contain within itself the equipment to perform its own special functions, the manner in which it executes them ultimately affects all other institutions for good or for ill. We can have no perfect society, then, so long as any one of its parts is imperfect, and no institution can be perfect so long as other institutions, or even their individual members, are defective.

The Interrelationships of Individuals and Society. These interrelationships in society may seem very complicated, and even discouraging, to the student of social reform. In the first place, he is confronted in his task of amelioration both by individuals and by organizations which need reform. Shall he try first to reform individuals on the theory that they precede and give character to organizations? Or shall he try to reform organizations on the theory that individuals are their offspring, and that good organizations will produce good individuals? The first point of view was formerly held to be the natural and correct one, for individuals do seem to precede societies and to form them, just as bricks already made are put together to form a house. But more recently the second theory

has tended to prevail. The individual appears more truly to be the result of the moulding of society, because social institutions are permanent and change but slowly, while individuals are temporary, and generations succeed one another with little change in the institutions themselves.

As a matter of fact each of these theories contains a measure of truth, and yet each is insufficient of itself, in that it presents only a partial or one-sided point of view. Or, it may be said, the two present different sides of the same truth. Individuals do form societies and impress their characters upon social groups; but it is just as true to say that individuals are formed by the institutions which have surrounded them. In as much as society and individuals continually act and react one upon another, improvements cannot be made by concentrating on one alone, but only by altering both. A temporary condition may require that one or the other should receive first or special attention; but the permanent situation is that they interact, and that both must always be taken into account.

The Relative Importance of the Different Institutions. If individuals and social organizations are of equal importance in the social system, what is the situation with regard to the different social institutions? They also are interdependent; but are they comparatively equal in their influence upon society as a whole, so that a reform in one would be just as far-reaching in its effects as reform in another? Or do some possess much greater relative influence than others? Since certain institutions absorb much more of the time and attention of the individual than do others, they are undoubtedly more fundamental to his welfare than others, and to the welfare of society itself. However, any definite division of institutions into classes, or even any arrangement in a hierarchy according to the order of their influence, would be impossible, for their relative power cannot be accurately measured.

Even an attempt to point out the one organization which was the most fundamental and influential would cause disagreement among scientists. We could approach the life of the group from the point of view of almost any activity and make that appear of primary importance to social welfare.

Certainly an excellent case could be made out for the family as the most essential of all social institutions. To have everyone well born, and well nurtured during the formative period of life, would seem to guarantee a population of such high character that it could correct the faults of other institutions, or else rise superior to them. But, as has already been pointed out, perfect families cannot exist in the midst of other imperfect institutions.

If, on the other hand, we analyze the work of the economic organization, we may easily become convinced of its importance, since it satisfies fundamental material needs and furnishes the means for individual development and for the satisfaction of the cultural desires. If the production of wealth were ample, and the distribution of it were on an equable basis, we might say that there would be opportunity then for the normal development of everyone and for the perfection of all social institutions. The economic organization is fundamental, to be sure, in the sense that it provides the means to make life something more than a sordid and barren existence; but it does not necessarily provide the spirit nor the intelligence to make wise use of the means it supplies. A society with material resources, but without ideals for their utilization, would be destined to remain in a state of barbarism.

If, then, our goal is the achievement of the finer values of life for everyone, we shall be led to emphasize the importance of the intellectual and ethical institutions. A society made up of individuals possessing superior intelligence, high ideals, and consideration for the rights of others, could make the most of a small amount of wealth, and would accomplish much more for civilization than a society with larger economic means but no spiritual vision. It might be convincingly argued, then, that the true welfare of society depended more vitally upon the activity and influence of its cultural associations than upon its material achievements. Yet, on the other hand, it could be convincingly shown, too, that cultural institutions fail to take root and flourish in poverty-stricken or degraded societies.

Still another point of view deserving attention is that the state, with its arm of authority in the law, is the all-important

institution, because to it belongs the power of directing and controlling both individuals and all other institutions. A state organization, then, if it possessed an efficient mechanism and was guided by leaders of broad vision, could control the material resources available, and so direct them as to make possible the attainment of a more perfect social organization. This point of view would be more convincing, if the state itself were some super-institution, imposed upon us from another sphere; but actually, of course, it is a mere product of society as it exists, and so reflects all the deficiencies and the evils of the social group. It seems more probable that the social group will have to reform the state, than that the state should find itself able to reform society.

The Relative Importance of Social Institutions Varies at Different Historical Periods. Any analysis of the mission and the influence of each of the various social institutions, though helpful in revealing the possibilities inherent in each for constructive action, offers little help in the solution of the great problem as to which institution is after all the most basic, and therefore the one which it would be most profitable to reform first. To avoid misunderstanding it might be added that the problem is not so much one of ascertaining which institution is most important in its functions, for several are indispensable, but of determining which has the greatest influence upon other institutions and through them upon society as a whole. Perhaps there is no general and universal answer to this question. As times and conditions change, different institutions bear the chief responsibility for exerting a corrupting influence upon the whole social body, and so stand in special need of reform. At one time it may be the church which is most at fault, at another the state, and frequently it appears to be the economic organization.

The Economic Organization is at Present of Paramount Importance. If we turn, therefore, from the general problem of the relative social importance of the various institutions to the specific problem confronting us today, we shall be led to the conclusion that the economic organization is at present the one in most pressing need of reform. As our study has

shown, not only does the economic organization contain many defects within itself, but these defects tend to penetrate other institutions and vitiate their activities. It has been pointed out that evils in the state and in the administration of justice, that defects in family life, and that even the failures in the work of the cultural associations, could ultimately be traced to poverty, or to unemployment, or to other weaknesses of the economic organization. On the other hand, economic evils are not so clearly traceable to the shortcomings of other institutions, but appear to be largely inherent in the mechanism of the economic organization itself. This statement is, however, relative and should not be interpreted too rigidly, for deficiencies even in the economic organization could not of course be entirely self-contained. Inevitably they are influenced by individual character and attainment, they are closely related to the family through the problem of population, and they are connected with the activities of the state. On the other hand, it must not be assumed that the deficiencies of other institutions are due entirely to economic evils. Each has its own defects, each influences every other directly. Nevertheless, after making all allowances for all these interrelationships, it does seem true that economic evils arise primarily in the economic organization itself; and that these evils affect the other institutions in a greater degree than they influence economic activities.

If this supposition is correct, then the conclusion to be drawn is that society as a whole would gain more from a reorganization of the economic system than from any other single reform. Economic reform would be difficult, and could be undertaken only after a painstaking analysis of existing conditions. In other words, economic adjustment would have to be preceded by a more scientific comprehension of the working of economic forces and of the best means of controlling and adjusting them. No permanent gain could be made by a hasty upsetting of the present order and an attempt to substitute abruptly a new and untried scheme. The present machine does work, however imperfectly, and less disturbance would occur if reforms proceeded slowly, and if specific evils were corrected as they ap-

pear, than would be the case if a sudden transition from one system to another were attempted.

Other institutions, however, need reform too. Although the economic organization seems to demand chief attention, the family is also giving cause for anxiety for a somewhat different reason. Whereas the economic organization has experienced a development too rapid to be entirely healthy, or to permit it to function smoothly, the family has encountered new social conditions and is endeavoring to adapt itself to its changed environment. The family is not in the process of disintegration, as some would have us believe, but is merely being acted upon by new forces, chiefly economic, which are necessitating readjustment. Temporarily the new conditions are causing the family to drift. No new standards nor ideals seem to have arisen to replace the old, and to reconcile its needs with the demands for individual freedom which have become so pressing. A leader is needed, not to direct a political revolution, but to point the way to family stability within a new social order.

If society is to be improved rapidly and uniformly, however, still other institutions must undergo reformation also. The state needs to assume a wider responsibility and to show more intelligence and foresight in reorganizing and redirecting social forces. Then it could become a powerful agent in the reconstruction of social life. Moreover, if cultural organizations could make a more alluring appeal to the people and could perform their various missions more efficiently, they also would prove vital factors in perfecting the social order by increasing intelligence and raising ethical standards.

The Interdependence of Social Institutions Hastens Progress. The phenomenon of the close interdependence of institutions offers an explanation of the well-recognized fact that under favorable conditions social progress tends to become cumulative and rapid; and, obversely, that stability in society tends to become fixed and unyielding. History offers examples of societies which seem to have become stable and rigid, as China was for centuries. It also offers examples of societies in rapid deterioration, like ancient Rome. In con-

trast to these, occasionally societies show continuous periods of improvement, as the United States is doing at the present time.

Societies become stable when their more fundamental institutions appear to have become well adapted to their work. Then members of a society take the easy course and perpetuate the social system in vogue by acting as previous generations have been accustomed to act. The minor institutions adjust themselves to the fundamental ones, and finally the whole mass becomes rigid and unyielding. Custom rules, desire for improvement vanishes, change slackens and finally ceases, as institutions become, not perfected, but merely so adapted to one another that little incentive remains to modify them. Societies in this condition may not be degenerate; rather are they stagnant, the same mode of life being continued generation after generation.

In contrast to the forces of stability, changes in society, either for better or for worse, when once begun, easily accelerate their pace and become difficult to manage, simply because alterations in one institution tend to influence the others. If a change in an institution is in the nature of a disease, it tends to infect the whole of society. If the change is in the nature of an improvement, it stimulates adaptation of other institutions to a higher level of attainment. If greed and avarice, along with dishonorable methods of action, enter into economic relationships, for example, the corruption easily spreads to the political sphere, and even the church and other cultural institutions may become permeated with the prevailing spirit of decadence. We like to feel that there are institutions that can remain uncontaminated by corrupting influences from neighboring organizations, able to hold aloft their idealism without danger from changing social conditions. But this hope is unwarranted. Even ethical institutions, since they are part of the general social organization, must be influenced to a greater or less extent by the social life which surrounds them. Social contagion may be avoided only as institutions remove themselves from social contacts; and, if they draw away, their influence wanes correspondingly.

On the other hand, if increased individual freedom were to be achieved in one institution, such as the state, the desire for similar freedom in other departments of social life would gradually bring about reforms in such other institutions as the economic organization and the family, and even our ideals and beliefs would become so tinged with it that the cultural institutions also would show the effect of the new sentiments. When the spirit of progress is once introduced into a society, modifications are likely to be widespread and changes continuous. Reforms once started, therefore, are likely to introduce a long period of readjustment before a state of equilibrium is reached. In social life change tends to inaugurate change; and, conversely, conditions of stability tend to become permanent. How, then, it may be asked, does a society which has become stationary ever again start on the road to progress? And how does a progressive society restrict its pace to safe limits and avoid the perils of anarchy?

To a society which has become stationary, change is most likely to come from some external force acting upon it, rather than from any effort exerted within the group. Under modern conditions of communication, the stimulus is likely to result from social contacts with other peoples, though it may arise from changes in the physical environment which produce migrations, or in one way or another alter the settled mode of life.

Progressive societies are saved from too precipitous changes, partly by that natural conservatism of their members, which is induced by the powerful force of habit, and ultimately by the sense of self-preservation itself. The forces of conservatism in the long run are wholesome, because they tend to prevent violent and sudden changes. The conservatives in society perform the indispensable service of criticizing and postponing new proposals, which, if hurriedly adopted, might lead to social disorganization.

Social Institutions Are Highly Adaptable. Another interesting characteristic of social institutions is that they are plastic and adaptable in their functions. They have not yet become entirely differentiated and specialized, and can, if need

be, take on more than one function. Their adaptability seems to be partly a matter of the degree of their development, for the institutions in rural communities and in primitive societies are the ones most easily altered. In such communities fewer institutions exist anyway; and these seem capable of enlarging their scopes so as to perform all the social work necessary. In older and more developed communities more organizations exist, and they have become more fully specialized. With them any extension of their primary function is more difficult; but it is not impossible, for none of the institutions becomes absolutely rigid.

The adaptability of social institutions seems to resemble the principle of compensation in physiology, where one organ is made to substitute more or less well for a defective one. Even in cases of a loss of such highly developed organs as the eye or ear, other organs extend their scopes or become more acute, in an attempt to do the work of the injured member. Similarly in society, if some of the minor organizations are lacking, such as those for social or recreational purposes, other institutions expand and try to cover all community needs. Even when a fundamental institution like the state fails in an important function, such as the issue of money, economic organizations come in to supply the need. In communities where institutions for the administration of justice have been lacking, or have seemed inadequate, informal organizations of citizens have taken upon themselves the preservation of order.

This elasticity is a desirable quality in institutions, since it makes the social organization adjustable and enables it to survive periods of abnormal conditions. New communities such as those which spring up on the frontier, and old communities during periods of stress occasioned by war or some other catastrophe, are practically dependent upon the ability of a few basic institutions to extend the range of their activities.

Dangers Due to the Elasticity of Institutions. Notwithstanding its advantages, this characteristic of adaptability in institutions gives rise to the problem of the proper scope of each in the more fully developed communities. If institutions

have the power to expand their work in time of need, they may do so for their own aggrandizement when the need is not so pressing. When society needs the coöperation of its institutions and the efficient performance of their specialized services, they may instead be competing with one another, or encroaching on spheres of action not properly their own. In an animal organism, rivalry of organs would not occur, because the body is directed by a single conscious center. But neither in the community nor in the state does there exist any such center of absolute control. Control resides in each institution or association, and ultimately is shared by every individual member. In each association the intelligent members act together voluntarily; but the various associations are not strongly coördinated, and so may easily overlap and duplicate one another's work.

While the situation is not serious enough to disrupt society, nevertheless it may in certain cases interfere with the smooth and efficient action of the social mechanism. In a society whose institutions are all over-developed, a competition is bound to occur among them which will affect their spirit and their attitude towards one another. They become self-conscious; and, instead of aiming at the unselfish performance of social service, each strives for popularity in the community by working for its own aggrandizement. The situation not only destroys the spirit of service, but it interferes with the effective performance of their own special functions. For, in an effort to prove themselves serviceable organizations, they may undertake subordinate activities which they are not really fitted to perform.

In new societies, however, which have few specialized institutions, all the necessary social work does have to be done by extending beyond normal limits the activities of the few that are present. In these cases the problem always arises as to whether the extra work should be shared by several organizations or assigned to one alone. If the latter alternative is adopted, there still remains the question of deciding which organization is best fitted to undertake it. In this problem of the social division of labor, it will be found that the family,

the school, and the church are possible competitors for certain kinds of social service; and the economic organization, the professional and occupational groups, and the political organizations may compete in other fields. Some of the special qualifications of these various organizations for undertaking different types of social work have already been discussed in previous chapters, and they need not be reviewed here. It may merely be emphasized in conclusion that it is important in the less advanced communities that such social institutions as they do possess should come to a definite understanding with regard to the division of labor in social service, in order that the dangers of duplication and wasted effort may be avoided.

The Functions of Social Organizations Summarized. *Preliminary considerations.* We are now ready to conclude this study by a review of the special characteristics of the various social organizations and a consideration of the reforms which they need in order that social life may be improved. Since these associations exist merely to satisfy the needs of individuals, let us consider what are the requirements for the attainment of a complete social life. The individual is a composite of many desires which must be satisfied, and of many characteristics which must be developed, if he is to find life enjoyable and profitable. Although his specific desires are innumerable, certain classes or types of them may be noted here, because they can be satisfied only in groups or through formal organizations. In the first place the individual must supply his physical needs, and he must live in a community where there is protection for both persons and property. It is desirable that he should establish a family center where children may be trained to take their places in and contribute to the society of the coming generation. He ought to have a broad and satisfying intellectual life, as well as a comfortable physical existence; and he needs congenial social relationships. Finally, he must learn to respect the rights of others and also to coöperate with others to promote the highest interests of society as a whole.

But human beings have other aspirations over and above

these ordinary needs, which demand satisfaction. They are capable of reaching higher and higher stages of development along intellectual and spiritual lines. And, therefore, an ideal society, besides satisfying ordinary needs, should be prepared to stimulate its members to achieve the highest intellectual and spiritual levels they are capable of attaining.

Normal social relationships. Reviewing the social organizations in the order followed in the previous chapters, we found, first, that the individual must associate with others not merely for his pleasure but also to obtain normal development, because his character and personality can mature only through contact with and knowledge of other personalities. This association should be very intimate and close during the early years of growth within the family circle. But, as the child grows older, it becomes desirable that he should enlarge his circle of acquaintance to include a greater variety of people with whom he may enter into more casual and formal relationships, though he should always retain his intimacy with the few. It was pointed out, however, that, with the modern trend towards large and dense populations, intimate friendships are becoming more and more difficult to make; and the advantages that used to be derived from them are lost to us as these are replaced by numerous and superficial acquaintanceships. This is regrettable as it impairs the development both of personal and of social traits; and some modification of our social relationships will have to be evolved to overcome the loss.

The economic organization. After discussing those social relationships which determine the growth of the personality, we turned next to a consideration of the more permanent social institutions organized to satisfy specific needs of the individual, both physical and intellectual. Of these the economic organization was considered first because it is fundamental, in as much as it is intended to furnish the material necessities of life and to provide the means for the satisfaction of cultural wants as well.

Our present economic organization, however, is very far from realizing this ideal. One of the fundamental causes of its

failure is that people have come to regard material things as ends in themselves instead of as means. The prevalence of this attitude causes a constant struggle for the possession of material wealth in as large amounts as possible, with little regard to its actual serviceableness. We have the lamentable spectacle of men of ability wasting their energies in the mere accumulation of a credit balance, which they never fully utilize, instead of directing their talents towards the cultivation of science and of art, as did the ancient Greeks and the Italians of the Renaissance. This competition results in extreme differences in the distribution of wealth, for it comes to be divided according to ability to accumulate rather than according to needs. Some receive so much that they become demoralized; and others receive so little that they have no opportunity to develop the powers within them.

Not only is the spirit of economic life perverted, but there are serious defects inherent in the organization itself. A notable flaw is that laborers who are able and willing to work are often unable to find employment. We have become so accustomed to this defect that we tolerate it; but it should be regarded as a very serious social malady, for the least that could be asked of an economic organization would be that it should offer the means of livelihood to every capable person desiring work. The situation might possibly be improved by the appointment of a head, connected with the government, who should assume general direction of economic activities. Lacking such a head, the economic organization is allowed to rest upon individual initiative and the struggle for profit; and these fail to ensure a smoothly running machine. Under our present competitive system, the evil of unemployment is traceable to a lack of balance, or proportion, in the three factors of production, and particularly to an oversupply of labor of the lower grades. Other defects in the economic organization exist, but those mentioned are especially menacing to material well-being. Moreover they react to the detriment of the other social organizations as well.

The family. The family, the second fundamental institution discussed, is peculiar in that it has given up a number of

its former functions and has gradually diminished in size. It still retains several functions, however, which appear to be essential and cannot be surrendered. The ideal family should, first of all, be the medium for the mating of the sexes; and the family group thus begun should provide in a home the comforts necessary to the welfare of its members. Especially should it aim to provide an environment suitable for the training of children to enter the larger life of society.

In too many cases these purposes are not realized, and the reasons for failure are many and complicated. There are, of course, instances of individuals who are too defective to be able to enter into normal family relationships. But even when the partners in a marriage are themselves fairly normal, discord between them may still result from incompatibilities of temperament, not discovered in time, perhaps because of a hasty marriage. Ignorance on the part of either, or the lack of training necessary to make the home attractive, all menace the stability of the family. Finally, families may be demoralized because of poverty, due perhaps to temporary unemployment, so that even with the best intentions they are unable to rear their children properly.

In addition, however, to these rather obvious causes of failure, there is a subtle influence now at work menacing the efficiency and stability of the family group. The gradual change which has been going on in economic and social life, and the alteration which has come about in social ideals, especially for women, have left the family in an unsettled condition. No permanent improvement will take place until new standards for family life are evolved in harmony with modern ideas of individual freedom and individual development. It is to be hoped that the final readjustment to other institutions will produce a family organization superior to that of the past. As for the immediate causes of failure in the family, such as ignorance, poverty, or ill-considered marriages, they are more or less interrelated; and they can never be wholly removed until there is an improvement in the economic organization which will insure a more equable division of wealth.

The state. The state is the one organization which includes

all the people of a given area; and its duty is to devote itself to the promotion of the welfare of all its people. Of course in so doing it also advances the interests of individual citizens, which after all is the aim sought; but it should never favor one class or one section of its domain to the neglect of other classes or districts, nor should it ever further the individual interests of the few to the detriment of the many.

The fields which the state may properly enter to promote the general welfare are too numerous and varied to review. But the old idea that it should confine its activities to the protection of its citizens from the encroachments of other states, and to the maintenance of order within the state, has been generally abandoned. No definite bounds to state activity have been agreed upon to replace the old conception of its limitations; but the general rule may be laid down that the state should not undertake any enterprise which it cannot perform more satisfactorily, considering all the circumstances involved, than can private individuals.

The ideal of impartiality in state action is seldom realized in practice, because states are almost certain to be more solicitous for the welfare of some classes than for others. No doubt this fault is traceable usually to the general training and the natural sympathies of its officials, rather than to any venality or intended partiality. Yet governments do sometimes manifest open partiality for certain classes or districts, as is shown by the granting of special privileges to a few individuals, or the giving of disproportionate aid to certain sections of the country. Favoritisms of this kind are the result also of imperfections in the distribution of wealth. When powerful economic classes exist they are likely to be influential politically; and consequently they are often able to force the granting of special favors. Furthermore, political leaders, who devote their time to party interests and render special services, are often in a position to demand economic rewards from the government.

Other faults of the state are not so evidently the result of economic conditions. They are due partly to imperfections in the mechanism of the state, especially in its methods of ad-

ministration, and often they are the result of the incapacity of officials. In a democracy officials are likely to be of no more than average attainments; and usually they are far from possessing the specialized knowledge and training so essential for the task of regulating social relations and of directing social progress.

Judicial institutions. The institutions designed to protect citizens from violence, and to dispense justice on a basis of equality between individuals, are organs of the state; and they are likely to partake of all the defects of that institution. Notwithstanding the complicated system of police, trial courts, and penal institutions, and in spite of vast sums spent, judicial institutions prove powerless to protect citizens from injury by others; and they are quite incapable of reforming the criminally inclined.

Their failures are partly due to the fact that their organization is usually in the hands of a political group which is content merely to continue to use archaic methods, ignoring entirely the psychological and social laws of human behavior. Such reforms as have been successfully introduced have usually come from without rather than from within the organization. But the spirit animating the judiciary is also open to criticism, for justice certainly is not always administered impartially and equitably. The rich and the powerful are continually getting better terms from the courts than are the weak and the poor. This injustice is due only in part to any bias or sympathy for the wealthier classes. Over and over again, it is the outgrowth of innumerable technicalities and subterfuges of procedure, of which advantage may be taken much more easily by the rich than by the poor. The courts themselves should not bear all the blame for this condition of affairs. Legislatures are at fault also, and economic inequalities foster partiality. Agitation for reform, however, could well come from the courts or from the legal profession. Of all our prominent social institutions, the department of justice is probably the weakest and most in need of immediate reform.

Although reform of the judicial system would not be so fundamental and regenerative to the rest of society as reforms

in the economic system, nevertheless abuses in the organization of justice are more obvious and easier to correct. Their continuance is therefore less excusable. Our delay in instituting judicial reforms is the more inexplicable, because on the whole the judiciary is in the hands of an educated class of men, who are themselves widely represented in legislative bodies where reform could be initiated. But within this institution there seems to be little sentiment of unity or of loyalty, and little pride in improving its structure or in promoting the efficiency of its action. In a country which ordinarily is remarkably free from the bonds of tradition, and is generally receptive to new methods, the department of justice seems to be dominated to an unusual degree by the force of precedent. In fact it is so hidebound by conventions that judicial reforms in this country, as in England, may have to be instituted from without.

Cultural institutions. Of the cultural institutions less need be said in review. An elaborate educational system exists for the purpose of developing, as adequately as possible, the intellectual capabilities of every member of society, and thus providing the first impulse towards raising mankind to a plane above the material. Needless to say, this ideal is far from being accomplished, partly because of characteristics in the population itself, such as poverty or perverted ideals, and partly because of defects in the system of education. Conditions, largely economic, prevent a majority of the population from devoting sufficient time to study to profit greatly by the educational facilities provided. Thus at the start the schools are kept from fulfilling their mission completely, through no fault of their own.

Educational defects within the school system are numerous; but, while they interfere with its efficiency, they are not serious in the sense that they indicate decadence or even incapacity. Perhaps no social institution is more self-critical. Its chief defects reflect for the most part the rudimentary state of the science of education. Experiments are continually being made; and, as new methods prove their worth, they will be gradually introduced and the system will be improved. There

is unquestionably some tendency for the schools to be unduly conservative, and to cater to the established beliefs of the more influential part of the population; but this fault is after all less conspicuous than it is in some other institutions.

Either in connection with the school system, or perhaps even better as an entirely independent municipal department, recreational associations should be formed in every community to provide opportunities for recuperation for all its young people. Especially should they have opportunities for exercise, so that they may undergo that discipline which comes from competitive sports. The problem here does not call for reform of existing organizations, but for extension of them. This will come as the need for them is more fully realized, and as competent persons are trained for the work of leadership.

Beside the school stands the church as an ancient and universal institution, indispensable to the highest achievements of society. Its function is to direct the people towards spiritual rather than material interests, and to serve as a guide in the formation of ethical ideals and in the practice of moral conduct. Its task may be said to be the crowning effort of a civilization, for it aims to improve the quality of the people and uplift their social life.

The church in modern times seems to have lost some of its ancient prestige and power, owing partly to the strong hold that material interests have taken on the people, and partly to its failure to adapt itself to new conditions. Probably this decrease in the influence of the church is temporary, in as much as the religious need is fundamental and continuous with every people. Its prestige can be regained only by its abandonment of archaic creeds and ancient forms no longer in harmony with the new spirit of the times and the modern trend of thought, and by concentration upon fundamental truths which always remain applicable to individual needs and to social relations.

Other cultural institutions, such as those for the promotion of art and of science, are of much greater importance for the normal life and development of society than is usually supposed. The former exist particularly for the purpose of

raising the level of civilization, and the latter for the stimulation of progress. Associations for the promotion of art and science, like recreational organizations, stand in need of development rather than of reform. Considering our remarkable economic prosperity, there is no reason why scientific and artistic institutions should not receive ample support and encouragement. Perhaps no other organization would yield richer or more immediate returns for the money and effort expended upon them.

Conclusion. Society is made up of individuals with numerous desires to be satisfied, and with various characteristics, mental and physical, to be directed and developed. In pursuit of satisfaction man associates with his fellow beings, sometimes informally, and sometimes in formal and permanent organizations, for the accomplishment of particular purposes. These permanent organizations, while very diverse both in their character and in their purposes, are nevertheless closely related and react upon one another constantly. When an institution becomes decadent, its influence is demoralizing to the others, and if it can be reformed it is revitalizing to the whole of society. While this is true of all institutions, some of them possess greater influence than others upon the life of society as a whole. The institutions exercising the greatest control may differ at different periods, as the social life changes; but under present conditions the economic organization is doubtless of primary importance; and reforms in this institution would improve all departments of social life. Rapid changes in it are now going on, and the family has begun to feel their effects and is attempting to adjust itself to the new conditions. If a more equitable economic system can be inaugurated, all the other social institutions should soon reflect the change by showing new vitality.

TOPICS FOR REPORTS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Of all the organizations to which you belong, how many did you join voluntarily? Could you withdraw from all of them?
2. In your experience do the family, the school, and the church

overlap at all in their work? If so, which do you think does the work the best?

3. What organizations are most essential to the life of a community? What organizations could be dispensed with at least sacrifice?
4. Which organizations exercise the greatest amount of restraint upon the individual?
5. In which organizations does the individual have the greatest influence?
6. Describe the changes which take place in the various institutions as societies become large and populations dense. Which institutions are altered most?
7. Has increased rivalry, so noticeable in dense populations, affected all institutions alike?

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Ellwood, Charles A., *The Psychology of Human Society,* Chapter 16.

Hawthorn, H. B., *The Sociology of Rural Life,* Chapters 17 and 18.

Hertzler, J. O., *Social Institutions,* Chapter 11.

Ross, E. A., *Principles of Sociology,* Chapter 19.

INDEX

Agricultural production, 87, 88
Amusements, *see* Games
Architecture, 322, 325
Art, 97, 143, 319, 350, 351; civic, 327; development of, 323, 328, 329; museums of, 97, 320, 321; promotion of, 326, 327; purposes of, 320; and ideals, 117; and social life, 43, 44; in the United States, 323, 326
Artists, 323; education of, 328
Association, forms of, 281; modern characteristics of, 38, 39; reason for, 19, 344; results of, 19 ff.
Associations, church, 280, 281; cultural, 335, 337, 338, 349; family, 104, 105; organized, 52; permanent, 26; political parties, 165; school, 214, 216; state, 164; characteristics of, 29 ff.; effects of, 44-46, 52

Birth rates, 130, 135; and standard of living, 136, 137
Business, education for, 71; managers, 71

Capital, 73, 74 [292
Charity Organization Society, 291,
Child, socialization of, 133
Children, freedom of, 107; training of, 112, 120-122
Church, 30, 31, 54, 60, 107, 108, 243, 276, 332, 343, 350; attendance, 282, 283, 285; defects of, 281 ff., 300; membership, 281, 282; purpose of, 278, 279; reforms, 288, 289; and philanthropy, 290; and schools, 243; and social work, 279, 293-297
Church associations, character of, 280, 281
City planning, 321, 325
Civic art, 327
Clergy, education of, 287
Cleveland Museum of Art, 320
Colleges, *see* Universities
Commodities, purchase of, 91-94; utilization of, 99
Communities, rural, 52, 53; urban, 52, 53
Conservation, 340
Consumption of wealth, 89, 91, 98, 99, 101, 102
Conversation, 39-41
Cooley, C. H., 28
Correspondence Schools, 215
Court appeals, 197
Courts, defects in, 188, 348; reforms in, 193 ff., 201, 204, 295, 349; rules of procedure of, 193, 194; specialization of, 198; and economic organization, 205
Criminal Law, 184, 185
Crises, *see* Industrial depressions
Cultural: associations, 335, 337, 338, 349; education, 228, 229; wants, 97
Community: centers, 271-274; church, 299, 300

Death rates, 130
Defectives, control of, 153
Democracy, 167; advantages of, 177, 178; defects of, 168 ff., 177; education for, 177; new conception of, 179, 180; and sexual mating, 113, 114; in the family, 106, 107
Department of Justice, 332, 333
Depressions, industrial: 84; causes of, 85; remedies for, 86, 87, 88, 89
Desires, satisfaction of, 90, 94, 95
Dissipation, 251, 252, 260
Destruction of wealth, 61-65, 81, 82, 99, 345
Distribution of wealth, defects in, 74-79
Division of labor, 59, 61; and population growth, 141, 144
Divorce, 110, 111

Economics, science of, 5
Economic organization, 55, 335-338, 343-345, 351; problems of, 61-65; and the courts, 205
Economic organizations, character-

istics of, 58-61; problems of, 60-65; purpose of, 58
Education, 6, 71, 80, 81, 98, 320, 327, 332; cultural, 228, 229; expense of, 212, 219, 220; purposes of, 207, 208, 227; for business, 71; for democracy, 177; of the clergy, 287
Elective system, 240
Endowments for research, 313, 314
Environment, esthetic, 322; physical, 3; social, 3, 4
Ethics, 6
Eugenics, 151, 152; program of, 152 ff.

Factors of Production, 76, 77
Family, 31, 32, 52, 54, 60, 61, 104, 295, 303, 332, 333, 335, 337, 338, 342, 345, 346, 351; changes in, 105-107; democracy in, 106, 107; desirable size of, 132, 134; disintegration of, 108, 113, 126; form of association of, 104, 105; functions of, 112, 346; and the economic condition, 127, 128; and population growth, 155, 156; and the schools, 211, 221, 222; and the welfare of adults, 127
Fascists, 177
Freedom, individual, 49; of children, 107
Friendship, 45, 53

Games, 45, 46, 253, 254, 256, 262, 270, 273
Gill and Pinchot, 282

Heredity, 120
Home, 108; as a social center, 125, 126. *See also,* Family
Hours of labor, 69, 70

Ideals, social: 52; and art, 117; in sexual mating, 116
Immigration, 78
Incomes, source of, 78, 79
Individual, development of, 23, 24, 44, 216, 239, 240, 250, 331, 332; freedom, 49; needs of, 343; socialization of, 106, 208, 210; and society, 334, 344
Industrial depressions, 84, 85; remedies for, 86-89
Industry, labor in, 67, 70, 72; wastes in, 66, 67
Inequalities in wealth, 74, 75
Infant mortality, 122
Insect pests, 100
Institutions, 58, 70; relative importance of, 334 ff. *See also,* Organizations
Instruction, methods of, 215, 233 ff.
Insurance, 100; unemployment, 89
Inventions, 150, 317

James, William, 238
Judges, 199, 200, 204; appointment or election of, 201 ff.; functions of, 189; powers of, 196, 197
Judicial institutions, 348, 349. *See also,* Courts
Jury, 189; system, 195, 196
Justice, administration of, 184; department of, 332, 333; standards of, 184, 185
Juvenile delinquency, 250

Knowledge, advancement of, 27; classification of, 209. *See also,* Science

Labor, 250, 251; division of, 59, 61; hours of, 69, 70; in industry, 67, 70, 72
Law, 337; criminal, 184, 185; delays of, 189, 190; purpose of, 14; technicalities of, 188, 189
Leadership, 47
Letter writing, 41, 42
Literature, 321, 324, 325

Machinery, labor-saving, 68, 69; in production, 81
Marketing, 67
Marriage, modern attitude towards, 117, 118
Marriages, 127
Mating, sexual, 113, 119
Military drill, 273
Morality, 277, 278
Mortality, infant, 122
Moving pictures, 257, 259, 263, 268, 269
Museums of art, 97, 320, 321
Music, 321; 323-325; 327

Newspapers, 327

Organizations, efficiency of, 26, 46 ff.
Organizations, economic, 55; char-

acteristics of, 58-61; problems of, 61-65; purpose of, 58; social, 50, 54
Organized associations, 52

Parks, 261
Penalties, 192
Play, 249
Play grounds, 261, 262
Police, 185; training of, 186
Police system, defects of, 186-188; reforms in, 188
Political parties, organization of, 165
Politics, 5; as a profession, 171-174
Pleasure, search for, 43
Population, increase of, 78, 131, 132; quality of, 150 ff.; stationary, 145, 146; and economic conditions, 156; and food supply, 146, 147; and social needs, 138; and war, 138
Population growth, results of, 139; and division of labor, 141, 144; and the family, 155, 156; and progress, 148; and social institutions, 142-144; and standard of living, 132, 146, 149, 150, 155
Poverty, 75
Prices, variations in, 93
Problems, social, 9-11
Production, 61, 63, 65-70, 86, 87, 92, 101, 102; agricultural, 87, 88; economic, 326; factors of, 76, 77; improvement in, 37, 70-74; machinery in, 81
Profit-sharing, 73
Progress, social: 9, 11, 15; and population growth, 148
Psychology, social, 9, 11
Public Libraries, 267, 322
Public officials, qualifications of, 175
Public opinion, 24
Purchasing commodities, 91-94

Rachmaninoff, 324
Radio, 41
Recreation, 6, 108, 243, 244, 248, 296, 329, 333; advantages of, 273, 274; problems of, 252 ff.; purposes of, 248 ff.; reforms in, 264
Recreational: associations, 350; directors, 264-266; needs of children, 255, 256; needs of adults, 256, 257; survey, 269
Recreational departments, organization of, 266-269, 277 ff.
Recreations, classified, 252 ff.; deficiencies of, 258 ff.; selection of, 262; and the schools, 243, 244, 266; in cities, 261, 262
Reforms, social, 10, 11, 50-52
Religion, 54, 276-278. *See also,* Church
Religious: conservatism, 286, 301, 302; denominations, 297, 298; leadership, 287
Reproduction, 112
Research, and teachers, 311, 312; and universities, 310-313
Rivalry, 22, 25
Rivalries, 45, 46; social, 95-97
Rural communities, 52, 53

Saving of capital, 74
School associations, forms of, 214-216
Schools, 30, 32, 60, 108, 207, 276, 290, 319, 329, 343, 349; private, 218, 222; public, 218 ff.; technical, 229, 230; activities of, 242; and curriculum, 227 ff.; decentralization of, 216, 217; defects of, 223, 245, 349, 350; efficiency of, 241, 242; equipment of, 224; limitations of, 212-214; and the church, 243; and the family, 221, 222, 246; and health, 243; and politics, 221; and recreation, 243, 244, 266; and the state, 246
Science, 70, 329, 350, 351; natural, 4; social, 4, 5; advancement of, 309, 310; benefits of, 305, 306; and progress, 307, 308
Scientific knowledge, dissemination of, 315-319
Scientific organizations, 309, 310
Sexual mating, 113, 119; and democracy, 113, 114
Social: abnormalities, 14, 15; classes, 169; control, 48, 49, 56; disease, 15; ideals, 52; problems, 9, 10, 11; progress, 15; reform, 10, 11, 50, 52; stagnation, 339, 340
Social groups, 22, 23; classified, 28, 29; large and small, 31-34
Social intercourse and recreation, 251
Social life, complexity of, 53
Social institutions, 33, 331-333;

adaptability of, 340, 341; interrelationship of, 351; rivalry of, 341-343; and progress, 338-340; and population growth, 142-144
Social organizations, 54, 56; large, 36-38; functions of, 343 ff.; study of, 12.
Social psychology, 9, 11
Social science, 6, 7, 316, 317
Socialization, 24, 25; of the child, 133; of the individual, 106, 208, 210
Society, 7, 351; and the individual, 333, 334
Sociology, nature of, 7, 9, 11; purpose of, 12-16; subdivisions of, 7-11
Sports, *see* Games
Stagnation, social, 339, 340
Standard of living, 80; and birth rates, 136, 137; and population growth, 132, 145, 146, 149, 150, 155
State, 30-32, 54, 55, 60, 107, 333, 336-338, 343, 346-348; activities of, 163; limitations of, 163; defined, 158; quality of, 170
State organization, character of, 164; defects of, 347, 348; development of, 166; functions of, 158, 347
Sterlization, 153
Stelze, Charles, 282
Superiors, multiplication of, 154, 155

Teachers, 224, 225, 236, 237, 244; and research, 311, 312
Technical schools, 220, 230, 231
Thought, superficial character of, 42, 43
Transportation, improvements in, 38
Trusts, 86

Unemployment, 72, 345; insurance, 89
Universities, 218-220, 230, 232, 240, 245; and research, 310-313
Urban communities, 52, 53
Utilization of commodities, 99

Wages, 79, 81; how determined, 75-78
Wants, cultural, 97
War, 160; and population, 138
Waste of wealth, 97, 99-101
Wastes of consumption, 91; of industry, 66, 67
Wealth, consumption of, 89, 98, 99, 101, 102; destruction of, 99; distribution of, 61-65, 74-79, 82; production of, 61-63, 65-70, 101, 102; waste of, 97, 99-101; inequalities in, 74, 75
Women, economic independence of, 109, 110
World Court, 160

University of British Columbia Library

DUE DATE

MAR 9 - REC'D

APR 11 REC'D

OCT 19 1966

OCT 18 REC'D

MAR 23 1967

MAR 23 REC'D

NOV 27 1967

DEC - 5 REC'D

APR 11 1968

DEC 11 1977

DEC 19 1977 RET'D

FORM 310

UNIVERSITY OF B.C. LIBRARY
3 9424 02000 9418